FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-116
Friday
15 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-116 *15 June 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Grinevskiy Comments on Vienna Arms Talks *[TASS]* 1
New Missile Negotiations Proposed to NATO *[AFP]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Pact Defense Ministers Meet in Berlin 14-15 Jun 2
Pact Called 'Stabilizing Factor' *[TASS]* 2
Meeting Opens *[TASS]* 2
Yazov Views 'Reorganized' Pact *[TASS]* 2
Bloc Electrical Industry Council Meets in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev Adviser Discusses German Unification *[East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 8 Jun]* 4
De Maiziere Talks in Washington Reported *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 4
Commentary Views Asia-Pacific Summit Discussion *[Moscow Radio]* 5
Future of Europe, Blocs Discussed *[Moscow International]* 6
'New Structures' Proposed To Replace Blocs *[TASS]* 7
Turnberry NATO Council Session Assessed *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 8
Army Role in Third World 'Arms Dealing' Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jun]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Cheney's 'Ambiguous' Speech Assessed *[TASS]* 13
Foreign Ministry Officials View U.S. Relations *[TASS]* 13
Bush Welcomes Talks With Baltic Leaders *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 14
Reportage, Commentary on Gorbachev Visit 14
Summit Results Reflected *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jun]* 14
'Mutual Trust' Seen as Gain *[PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 15
Fishing Trawler Seized Off Canadian Shores *[TASS]* 18
Canadian Navy Ships End Vladivostok Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 18

China

Cooperation With PRC on Regional Issues Seen *[Mikhaylov on Moscow International]* 18
More on Ryzhkov-Liu Huaqing 'Friendly' Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 19
CPSU Delegation Received by China's Qiao Shi *[TASS]* 19
Rogachev Speaks in Beijing on 'Cambodian Problem' *[Moscow International]* 19

Northeast Asia

Pankin Leads Military Delegation to DPRK *[Moscow International]* 19
Friendship Society Forming Ties With ROK *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 12 Jun]* 20
Japan's Foreign Minister Confirms Improved Ties *[Moscow International]* 20
East Bloc Trade Ministers Meet in Ulaanbaatar *[TASS]* 20

Near East & South Asia

Ivanov Assails Israel's 'Tougher' Policy *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 20
Israel's Refusal To Negotiate Criticized *[Moscow International]* 21
Iran's Karrubi Reelected as Majles Speaker *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 21
Libya's Al-Qadhdhafi Holds Talks With Katushev *[TASS]* 22
Arab-Soviet Chamber of Commerce Ends Session *[TASS]* 22

East Europe

CPCZ Leader on 'Unexpected' Communist Victory *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Jun]* 23
CPCZ Wins Despite Forecast *[Moscow International]* 23
Right-Wing Forces Defeated *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 24
Zagladin Attends Prague East Europe Symposium *[TASS]* 25
Yakovlev, GDR's Gysi Discuss Unification *[TASS]* 25
Yazov on Need for All-European Security *[Hamburg DPA]* 25
Split in Solidarity Forces 'Serious' for Poland *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]* 25
Poland's Walesa, Michnik Split Assessed *[KOMSOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 26
Polish Youth Group Poses Threat to Leadership *[KOMSOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 27
Kvitsinskiy, Polish Envoy Discuss Ties *[Warsaw PAP]* 29
Correspondent Details Bucharest Riots, Crackdown *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 30

West Europe

Bundeswehr Servicemen End Visit to USSR *[TASS]* 31
Bundestag Deputies End European Security Meeting *[TASS]* 31
FRG Reaction to Washington Summit Viewed *[PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 31
Radio, TV Protocol With FRG Signed 14 Jun *[TASS]* 32
Science Academy Head Attends FRG Forum *[TASS]* 32
European Trade Group To Help Train Managers *[TASS]* 33
UK Lawyers Plan To Aid Market Economy Switch *[PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 33
Sitaryan, UK Customs Official Discuss Cooperation *[TASS]* 34
Soviet 'Antisubmarine Ship' Visits Taranto *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jun]* 34
Soviet Military Delegation Visits Belgium *[TASS]* 34
Parliamentary Delegation Visits Portugal *[TASS]* 34
Netherlands Defense Minister To Visit in Jun *[TASS]* 34
Remains of Finnish POW's Identified *[TASS]* 34
Environmental Cooperation With Finland Noted *[TASS]* 35
Varennikov Welcome Norwegian Major General *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]* 35
Swedish Parliamentary Delegation Arrives *[TASS]* 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Gorbachev Exchange With Deputies Cited *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 37
Activities for 14 Jun Session Reported *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 41
Moscow TV Reports 14 Jun Supreme Soviet Session 43
Enterprise Taxation System Law Adopted *[TASS]* 44
Lukyanov Closes Supreme Soviet Session 14 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Ryzhkov Interviewed on Economic Reform Measures *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]* 45

Political & Social

Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress 46
Democratic Platform Viewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 21]* 46
Oblast Conferences on Platform *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Jun]* 47
Oblast Leaders Among Delegates *[PRAVDA 6 Jun]* 48
'New Approaches' to Congress *[PRAVDA 28 May]* 49
Revenko Address Newsmen on Federation Structure *[Moscow TV]* 49
Reportage on Peasants Congress Continues 49
Ligachev Criticizes Gorbachev *[Vienna Radio]* 49
Peasants Congress Ends *[TASS]* 50

Chernobyl Union To Hold Congress 15-17 Jun 50
Purpose Viewed *[TASS]* 50
Congress Opens *[TASS]* 50
AUCCTU Reviews Chernobyl Aid *[TRUD 6 Jun]* 51
Miners' Congress Slates Government Performance *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 51
Self-Determination Urged for All Nationalities *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 51
Ministry Describes Interethnic 'Chronicle of War' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]* 52
Academician Discusses Removing Ethnic Tension *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 29 May]* 53
Professional Internal Troops Unit Operational *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 56
Religiously Motivated Draft Dodging Examined *[MOSCOW NEWS No 22]* 57
'Unlawful Discharge' From Army Examined *[MOSCOW NEWS No 1]* 58
Lukyanov, Medvedev, Primakov Attend Opening *[Moscow TV]* 59
Various Obkom First Secretaries Elected *[PRAVDA 27 May]* 59
Defense Ministry Party Conference Held 8 Jun *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 60
Stroyev Attends Opening of Leaseholders' Congress *[PRAVDA 2 Jun]* 60
League of Communist Democrats Issue Statement *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 60
CPSU's Baklanov Cited on Kuzbass Situation *[TASS]* 60
Baltic, Caucasus Problems Outlined *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Frolov Discusses Socialism, Economy, Yeltsin *[Sofia DUMA 3 Jun]* 61
Bolshoy Leader Appeals for Improvements *[Moscow TV]* 62
Resistance to Dismantling Nuclear Submarines *[TASS]* 62
Status, Funding of Presidency Legislated *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jun]* 62
Reader Questions Killing of Czar's Family *[PRAVDA 5 Jun]* 63
New Human Rights Committee Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]* 64
Yeltsin Book on Sale in Sverdlovsk *[Moscow Radio]* 65
Tyumen Store Sells Goods Cheap to Pensioners *[Moscow TV]* 65

Economic

Fuel Shortages 'Extremely Serious' in Regions *[Moscow TV]* 66
Abalkin Highlights Goals of Reform Program *[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 23]* 66
Petrakov Discusses Differences in Reform Approach *[POISK No 18]* 71
'Convertible' Money Would Ease Market Switch *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 74
Conversion Poses Problems for Aircraft Industry *[PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 75
Lease Contract System Boosts Coalfield Output *[Moscow TV]* 80
Objection to Vyborg Enterprise Zone Voiced *[TRUD 7 Jun]* 81
Publisher Rebuts Paper Shortage Criticism *[IZVESTIYA 22 May]* 82

Agricultural

Chicken Farmers' Increased Production Praised *[Moscow TV]* 84
Late-May Weather, Crop Conditions Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 6 Jun]* 85
Agricultural Developments for 7-13 June *[Moscow Radio]* 86

Scientific

'Molniya-3' Satellite Launched 13 Jun *[TASS]* 86
Unique 'Lomonosov' Space Project Shelved *[TASS]* 86
Disarmament Raised in UN Space Committee Meeting *[TASS]* 86
Kola Radiation Checks Rebut 'Cloud' Story *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 87

Military

Defense Ministry Statement on Troop Reductions *[TASS]* 87
MiG-27 Bombers Reported on Kola Peninsula *[Budapest Radio]* 87
Conference Examines Military Training Safety *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jun]* 87
Defense Committee Views Forces' Prestige *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]* 88
Slow Response Over Cessna Landing Criticized *[TRUD 13 Jun]* 90

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Norway Reportedly Refuses Aid to Baltics *[Riga International]* 92
Baltic Popular Movements To Meet 16 Jun *[Riga Radio]* 92
Cooperation To Be Discussed *[Vilnius International]* 92
Baltic Republics Observe Day of Mourning *[TASS]* 92
Moscow, Baltic Dialogue Examined *[Moscow International]* 92
Article Assesses 'Baltic Freedom Day' *[TASS]* 93
Prunskiene Discusses Talks With Ryzhkov *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 93
Prunskiene Sends Letter of Thanks to Thatcher *[London Press Association]* 94
Landsbergis, Others Attend Vilnius Ceremony *[Vilnius International]* 94
Ceremony Described *[Vilnius Radio]* 95
Minister Views Communications Network Problems *[Vilnius Radio]* 95
Lithuanian Officials Discuss Radio Funding *[Vilnius International]* 95
Lithuanian Party Plenum To View Independence *[Vilnius International]* 96
Report on 'Persecution' of Non-Lithuanians *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]* 96
Legality of Lithuania's Accession Stressed *[TASS]* 97
Council Creates USSR Soviet Liaison Group *[Moscow TV]* 97
Estonian 14 June Supreme Soviet Agenda Announced *[Tallinn Radio]* 97
Estonian Parliament Discusses Immigration Law *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]* 98
Estonian Parliament Adopts Law on State Control *[Tallinn Radio]* 98
Estonian Deputy Urges Union 'Common Market' *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 98
Russian-Speaking Group in Estonia Admits Failure *[Tallinn TV]* 101
*Latvia Considers Export Restrictions *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 2 Jun]* 101
Latvian Food Hoarding Follows 'Independence' *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 2 Jun]* 102
Hoarding, 'General Instability' in Latvia *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 May]* 103
Latvian Bodies Discuss Future of Communist Party *[IZVESTIYA 22 May]* 103

RSFSR

'Probable' Candidates for RSFSR Premier Noted *[TASS]* 104
More Candidates Named *[TASS]* 104
Programs Presented *[Moscow Radio]* 104
Ryzhov Withdraws Candidacy *[TASS]* 104
Moscow TV Relays 14 June Supreme Soviet Session 105
Equality of Chambers Viewed 105
Committees Discussed 105
More on Committees 106
Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session 107
Session Dates Adopted *[Moscow Radio]* 107
Committees, Commissions Formed *[TASS]* 107
Protection Resolution Adopted *[TASS]* 107
Russian Communists Conference To Open 19 Jun *[Moscow International]* 107
Russian Bureau Session Viewed *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 108
Preparations Reported *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Jun]* 109
Members on Conference *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jun]* 109
Moscow Party Conference Delegates View 'Split' *[Moscow TV]* 111
Yakovlev Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 112
Moscow Party Appeals to Congress Delegates *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKA 26 May]* 113
Moscow Committees Prepare for CPSU Congress *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 22 May]* 113
Moscow Plenum Resolution on Market Transition *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKA 31 May]* 115
Moscow CPSU Chief on Alarm, Hope in Party *[Moscow TV]* 115
Russian City Cuts Party Structure, Apparatus *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 116
Moscow Rally Supports Baltic Independence *[Vilnius Radio]* 116

Western Republics

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Convenes 14 Jun 116
Court Staffing on Agenda *[Moscow TV]* 116
'Stalemate' at Session *[TASS]* 116
Law on State Symbols Passed *[Moscow International]* 116

Further on 12th Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Session 117
'Democratic Bloc' Makes Statement *[PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 117
'Opposition' Tactics Deplored *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 117
Ivashko Discusses Federation *[Kiev International]* 117
Language Question Resolved *[Kiev Radio]* 118
Ukraine Central Committee Discusses Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 119
Ukrainian Party Obkom Secretaries Elected *[RADYANSKA UKRAINA 30 May]* 119
Ukrainian Komsomol Votes To Change Name *[TASS]* 119
Chernobyl-Related Strike Committee Formed *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 17 May]* 119
Deputy Premier Describes Coalfield Improvements *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 121
Ukraine Broadcasters Protest Censorship *[Kiev Radio]* 121
Ukrainian Autocephalous Church Synod Meets *[Kiev International]* 122

Caucasus

Armenian Official Disputes Reports on Incidents *[ARMENPRES]* 123
Internal Ministry Troops Sent to Armenia *[Yerevan Radio]* 123
Independent Trade Union Established in Armenia *[Yerevan Radio]* 124
Armenian Party Leader Visits Laser Institute *[Yerevan Radio]* 124
Further on New Armenian Interior Minister *[ARMENPRES]* 124
Article on NKAO Situation, Azerbaijani Stance *[Yerevan Radio]* 124
Azerbaijan Parliament on State of Emergency *[Baku Radio]* 125
Arrests Reported for Illegal Crossings Into Iran *[Baku Radio]* 126
Baku Military Commandant Reports Arrests *[Baku Radio]* 126
Georgia To Convene Special Parliament Session *[Moscow Radio]* 126
Dispute Between Georgians, Abkhazianis Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 127
Gorbachev, Others Sign Georgian Writer's Obituary *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Jun]* 127

Central Asia

New Data on Famine in Turkmenia Found *[Moscow TV]* 127
Tajik Delegation Returns From Iran Visit *[Dushanbe Radio]* 127
Mudslides Hit Tajikistan, Casualties Reported *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 127
Direct Transport for Uzbek Pilgrims Decreed *[TASS]* 128
Uzbek Decree on Foreign Trade Examined *[Tashkent Radio]* 128
Uzbek Forestry Produce Directorate Formed *[Tashkent Radio]* 128
Andizhan 'Normalizing' Under State of Emergency *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jun]* 129
Reportage on Kirghizia Ethnic Conflict 129
Violence Declines *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jun]* 129
Report on Casualties *[Moscow Radio]* 129
Disturbances 'Organized' *[Moscow TV]* 130
Curfew 'Cut' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jun]* 130
Tents, Other Aid Airlifted to Osh Oblast *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 131
Osh Transport Functioning, Investigation Begins *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 131
Musaliyev Reads Report to Kirghiz Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 131
More on Report *[Moscow TV]* 132
Nazarbayev Appoints Zheltikov Trade Minister *[SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN 6 Jun]* 132
Semipalatinsk Leader on Nuclear Test Impact *[Moscow Radio]* 132
Buildings Destroyed in Kazakh Earthquake *[Moscow Radio]* 133

Grinevskiy Comments on Vienna Arms Talks

LD1406191290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1115 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Excerpts] Vienna, 14 Jun—Today's plenary sitting of the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe was visible evidence of the possibility of resolving the most complex questions at that forum, if there is the political will for that. The French and Polish delegation heads announced at the sitting that an accord had been reached in Vienna, leading to the reduction of tanks and armored vehicles. [passage omitted]

Oleg Grinevskiy, Soviet delegation head and ambassador-at-large, said in a conversation with the TASS correspondent that the solution signifies a considerable move forward. The path was not an easy one; it was paved through long and complex discussions, through a considered account of the East's and West's concerns and interests. The talks during the recent Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington were not insignificant, if not significant, in finding a compromise. We, the diplomat continued, agreed with the plan of the proposed solution and its package form. Numerical parameters are its main content. They all are acceptable to us. There is mutual understanding that will create a solid yet flexible basis, paving the way for the work on the definitions of tanks and armored vehicles soon to be concluded and for the agreed formulation of the relevant clauses to be begun, he added.

New Missile Negotiations Proposed to NATO

AU1506093190 Paris AFP in English 0924 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Brussels, June 15 (AFP)—The Soviet Union has proposed launching negotiations with NATO this autumn for the elimination of all short-range nuclear missiles, a diplomat said here Friday.

The talks would not be linked to the conclusion of the Conventional Forces in Europe talks (CFE), aimed at reducing conventional arsenals from the eastern Atlantic to the Urals, the source said.

Short-range missiles have a range of less than 500 kilometers (310 miles).

Pact Defense Ministers Meet in Berlin 14-15 Jun

Pact Called 'Stabilizing Factor'

LD1206173790 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—"Even today the Warsaw Treaty is a major, primarily political, factor of balance and stability in Europe," Army General Vladimir Lobov, chief of staff of the United Armed Forces of Warsaw Treaty member countries, told TASS. He made this comment in connection with the forthcoming meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Defense Ministers' Committee in Berlin on June 14.

The general recalled that the recent meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee focused on prospects for the common European process, for the new structures of security, and discussed ways to overhaul the activity of the Warsaw Treaty. According to Lobov, the Defense Ministers' Committee will have to discuss some specific questions in the wake of the decisions of the Political Consultative Committee.

The general said that the Defense Ministers' Committee's role in matters of upgrading military development in allied states and enhancing military preparedness of the Warsaw Treaty is hard to overestimate. The committee tackles at its regular meetings the more important questions connected with the implementation of the decisions of the Political Consultative Committee, armament of the united armed forces, and their combat preparedness.

"As a result they have modern weapons and equipment, the scientifically substantiated theory for their application," Lobov said.

He emphasised that the Warsaw Treaty continues to be a stabilising factor in Europe. "This fact is acknowledged by both the U.S. and its NATO partners," Lobov said.

According to him, the Warsaw Treaty, as a political factor, satisfies the current interests of security of the Warsaw Treaty countries. At the same time, Lobov believes, "the entire activity of the Warsaw Treaty needs to be radically reorganised."

Meeting Opens

LD1406105190 Moscow TASS in English 1043 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Berlin June 14 TASS—A regular meeting of the Committee of Defence Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty member countries opened in the capital of the German Democratic Republic today.

The committee will discuss questions of perfecting troops and naval forces of the allied armies and prospects for their development with taking into consideration the decisions of the 1990 Moscow conference of the Poliical Consultative Committee and of Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe.

Taking part in the work of the committee are Bulgarian Defence Minister General of the Army Dobry Dzhurov, Hungarian Defense Minister Dr. Lajos Fuer, GDR Minister for Defence and Disarmament Rainer Eppelmann, Polish Minister of National Defense General of the Army Florian Siwicki, Romanian Minister of National Defence Colonel-General Victor Stanculescu, Soviet Defence Miniser, Marshall of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Yazov, Czechoslovak Minister of National Defence, General of the Army Miroslav Vacek. Taking part in the meeting from the joint command are Commander-in-Chief of the Joint Armed Forces General of the Army Pyotr Lushev and Chief of Staff of the Joint Armed Forces General of the Army Vladimir Lobov.

"The Warsaw Treaty has far from exhausted its possibilities. It ensures favourable external condition for peaceful construction, for profound democratic transformations," Army General Pyotr Lushev said in his speech at the committee's meeting. He emphasised that the armed forces of the allied countries deserve much credit for preventing war over all the past decades. "And now the Warsaw Treaty is a guarantor of peace, stability and security in Europe," Lushev said.

Yazov Views 'Reorganized' Pact

LD1506074690 Moscow TASS in English 0716 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Berlin June 15 TASS—The Warsaw Treaty Defence Ministers' Committee ended its session here today. Participants adopted a joint communique. Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov described some of the session's results in a TASS interview.

"The Defence Ministers' Committee session was aimed at implementing the Political Consultative Committee's declaration that was adopted in Moscow on June 7, he said.

"Political processes taking place in Warsaw Treaty countries in many respects predetermine the current situation in Europe and the world as a whole. The positive trend of the processes is indisputable. At the same time changes in domestic and international life are so radical that they are often not smooth and at times painful.

"Resolving the contradictions that have piled up requires special responsibility from state, political and military leaders and circumspection in determining reliable reference points to keep work on track.

"It is needless to speak of the immense and truly historical role that the Warsaw Treaty Organisation [WTO] has played and continues to play in ensuring national and collective security.

"Our defence alliance still remains a real and effective factor in European security and the coordinator of the allied countries' efforts in the field of defence, arms reduction and disarmament.

"The founding of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation was prompted by the objective course of world development and by specific historical conditions of the late forties and early fifties.

"One should not forget that the North Atlantic bloc, set up by the Western powers, did not conceal its aggressive intentions and intensively prepared to implement them.

"Nowadays, decades later, we have no right to shut our eyes to the fact that NATO still exists and maintains all the attributes of its military might.

"The formation of a new European security structure has only begun. Many unforeseen obstacles and dangers lie ahead. The NATO strategy remains the same and declarations about the need to tailor it to current changes have yet to be backed up by practical moves. Moreover, the provision of NATO armies with the newest armaments is being speeded up, and its combat might is being built up. Under these conditions we cannot slacken our allied ties. Such a policy would be short-sighted and would have a negative effect on the balance of forces in Europe and on the stability of the situation on the continent.

"We are deeply convinced that the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, reorganised and adapted to new realities, can be an instrument for a more smooth and calm transition to a new system of European security.

"The WTO's self-removal and self-withdrawal from the European scene would complicate the current European process rather than facilitate it," Yazov said.

Bloc Electrical Industry Council Meets in Moscow

PM1306111790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p4

[TASS report: "Interelektro Council Session"]

[Text] The 34th session of the Council of the International Organization for Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation in the Field of the Electrical Engineering Industry, Interelektro, was held in Moscow on 7-8 June 1990.

Representatives of the countries belonging to the Interelektro Council from Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Cuba, Poland, Romania, the USSR, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia took part in the session.

Gorbachev Adviser Discusses German Unification

AU1206105690 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 8 Jun 90 p 2

[Article by Vadim Zagladin, adviser to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev: "A Mutually Acceptable Solution Can Be Found"]

[Text] The unification of both German states and the foreign-policy consequences resulting therein are among the most important vital questions of European policies and also of world politics. Thus it was quite natural for Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush to attach great significance to this issue during their talks in Washington.

The politicians outlined their basic approaches. They welcomed efforts by the Germans in the FRG and the GDR to live in a unified state and supported their desire for unity. They proceeded from the assumption that all internal aspects of this process are within the sphere of competence of the citizens in the FRG and the GDR. They also agreed that the Germans are free to determine their orientation in foreign policy.

During the discussion, the question concerning the military-political status of a united Germany arose as well, particularly the question concerning membership in one or the other military-political structure. It is quite clear that, without infringing upon the rights of the Germans and without violating their sense of honor, a solution must be found that does not harm anybody and which does not undermine the positive process that is under way on our continent and which is aimed at strengthening peace, confidence, and stability.

This is particularly important for the Soviet people who made incredible sacrifices during World War II. A decision that would endanger the interests of the Soviet Union would never be accepted in our country. Our parliament would not adopt it. If such a decision were made, we would have to reconsider all aspects, including the military aspect, that are linked with the safeguarding of security in the Soviet Union.

When discussing specific possibilities concerning a solution to this problem, the Presidents failed to reach agreement. They failed to eliminate differences of opinion. However, does this mean that the discussions were useless? No, one cannot say that.

Both sides are more familiar now with the position and the concerns of the other side. In the course of the discussion, during which Gorbachev submitted several proposals for a solution, new ideas emerged that deserve attention and further discussion. Both sides presented additional arguments and examined the possibility of viewing the situation from a new viewpoint.

The two leaders drew the conclusion that the issue must be further discussed by the foreign ministers and that experts must be consulted. All proposals of both sides must be examined in detail. The two presidents assigned these tasks to the foreign ministers of their countries.

Even if the two sides arrive at a common standpoint on the military-political aspect of German unification this will by no means be a final solution. Both presidents proceeded from the assumption that, first of all, there is a legal framework for such a decision—the two-plus-four talks. Second, there is no doubt that other countries, particularly Germany's neighbors, are entitled to a consideration of their interests. For this reason, not only talks between the ministers of the two countries are planned but also consultations with allies and other countries.

Basically, two processes must develop at the same time: the process aimed at settling the internal aspects of the merger of the FRG and GDR, and the process leading the final settlement of the results of the war. It must be ensured that these processes take place more or less simultaneously.

The development of these two processes will certainly require some time. As both Presidents pointed out, active work will be needed. No one can say at this point how much time will be required for this work. There will be a transition period whose termination will lead to the elimination of the rights of the four victorious powers resulting from the war, and to the birth of a sovereign new German state.

In the Soviet view, the solution to the problem concerning the transition period must fit into the all-European process which is aimed at the creation of an all-European system of security and cooperation on our continent.

On the basis of these common principles, the Soviet Union will continue its consultations with the United States and with other European states.

Mikhail Gorbachev is convinced that it will be possible to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution that takes into consideration the interests of peace and stability in Europe. We are concentrating our joint efforts on this goal.

De Maiziere Talks in Washington Reported

PM1306135190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Private Visit"]

[Text] Washington, 12 Jun—U.S. President George Bush received Lothar de Maiziere, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, who is paying a private visit here, on Monday in the White House.

This was the first meeting between the head of the U.S. Administration and the leader of the GDR Government, who will also meet with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and other members of the U.S. Government, and also Congressional representatives. The aim of these

conversations is to discuss the sides' positions on German unification, including the "two-plus-four" talks.

White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater said that President G. Bush informed L. de Maiziere about the discussion during the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting of the problem of German unification, confirming the United States' firm stance that a "united Germany must be a full member of NATO."

L. de Maiziere pointed out during a conversation with journalists that, as he told G. Bush, the nature of NATO must change "considerably" in order to take into consideration the Soviet Union's concern over the problem of security.

A special statement published later by the White House indicated the following: "The President and Prime Minister De Maiziere agreed that a united Germany must have full sovereignty from the time of unification," precluding any discrimination in this sphere, and must decide for itself "to which alliance it will belong." The document also points out that the U.S. President also voiced proposals regarding a "transformed Atlantic alliance and further talks on conventional and nuclear forces and a more significant role in the CSCE process." The statement says that these steps are designed to demonstrate that a united Germany's membership of NATO "will not pose a threat to the security" of the Soviet Union.

Commentary Views Asia-Pacific Summit Discussion

OW1506013490 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Commentary by political scientist Batalov entitled "The Echoes of Washington Summit"; from the "Commentary on Current Events" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, the Soviet-U.S. summit and its influence over the developments of the situations worldwide continues to be the topic of analysis, discussion, and prediction by the observers and experts of international issues in every country. What influences can possibly be caused by the results of the dialogue between Gorbachev and Bush in Washington over the situation in the Asia-Pacific region? Soviet political scientist Batalov deals with the issue in our "Commentary on Current Events" program. He writes as follows:

Judging from the press reports, people will know that the issue of the Asia-Pacific region was not among those items high on the agenda of the summit in Washington. Of course, this does not mean that the Soviet Union and the United States are no longer interested in Asia and the Pacific Ocean. Rather this is because, from the viewpoints of both the Soviet and U.S. leaders, there are no urgent and current issues like those in other spheres existing in the region—such as, for example, the issue of arms cuts and, first of all, the issue of reducing offensive strategic weapons and completely eliminating the danger of a nuclear war, or the issue concerning German reunification. Regarding the various agreements signed in the capital of the United States, as observers have pointed out, there is only one agreement directly affecting the Asia-Pacific region, and that is the the decision by the Soviet Union and the United States to establish a joint ecological protection zone in the vast expanse of the Bering Strait in the northern part of the region. According to President Bush, the protection zone will be like a bridge of friendship across Siberia and Alaska, enhancing the spirit of peace and cooperation and linking the people of the United States with those of the Soviet Union. It may be said that the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States decide to lay a few bricks of cooperation on the spot where their boundaries meet will definitely send out a signal to all other countries in the Asia-Pacific region. Therefore, it seems the echoes of the Washington agreement will reverberate in the boundlessly vast areas of the region.

I believe it is on this account that the first positive results from Soviet-U.S. relations are being continuously renewed, sending a flash of light through the omnious dark clouds which seem to be always gathering and hanging over the Korean peninsula. The soil of Korea was divied into two parts at the end of the 1940's and became a battlefield in the early 1950's. The two superpowers have always hoped to use their own allies on the peninsula to pose added threats to peace in Asia and all over the world in the course of their confrontation since then. Now, the meeting between the presidents of the Soviet Union and South Korea in San Francisco shows that the policy toward the Korean peninsula, backed by strength, is becoming a part of history. Moscow no longer looks upon South Korea as a vassal state, militarily and economically dependent on the United States. The reply from Seoul is giving up the attitude of treating the Soviet Union as an irreconcilable enemy, while the United States is taking measures which aim at going along with the DPRK. The split of Korea was a product of hostility and military confrontation. The current trend is putting an end to these traces and laying a foundation for mutual trust, support, and cooperation. In my opinion, reunification can only be brought about by this means.

Next, Soviet political scientist Batalov pointed out: The new climate in Soviet-U.S. relations is also making them change their attitudes to the Indochina situation. Not long ago, Washington was still trying hard to take advantage of the Cambodian conflict to hinder the Soviet Union in its friendly move toward China. Moscow and Beijing already changed from competition to cooperation, including cooperation under the condition of exploring ways for a solution of the Cambodian conflict with U.S. participation in the process of mediation.

The fact that the Soviet-U.S. relations are changing forces the authorities in Tokyo to think over the issues concerning themselves. Japanese are getting less and less worried about the so-called Soviet threat; and the Japanese industrial sectors are getting more and more

envious of the stepped-up dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union and between South Korea and the Soviet Union. As a result of such development, Japan has already begun looking for new guiding principles for its policies which are unacceptable to the Soviet Union, China, Korea, and the ASEAN countries. The Soviet Union is also reconsidering its attitude to Japan and looking for new measures for solution of the so-called problem concerning Japan's northern territories.

The problem of superpower's military presence in the region also cropped up in another microcosm of the background of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region, which is developing and changing all the time. Not long ago, Moscow and Washington considered each other's preparations for war a threat to their own security and, therefore, did their utmost to intensify the military buildup. What they are talking about now is, nevertheless, to reduce their military strength in the Asia-Pacific region within the overall framework of disarmament. They already began to take action in this direction. In short, we have every reason to believe that the summit between Gorbachev and Bush in Washington is another step taken toward establishing mutual understanding and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States and will have a positive influence over the current situation in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as the prospect of its smooth development in the future.

Dear listeners, what you have just listened to is a commentary on current events by Soviet political scientist Batalov. It is entitled "The Echoes of the Washington Summit."

Future of Europe, Blocs Discussed

LD1406134190 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Speaking in parliament, President Mikhail Gorbachev has said the USSR might agree to a united Germany's membership in NATO as an associated member, provided the nature of the military alliances, both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, have changed. The military adviser of the central committee of the Soviet Communist Party, General Geliy Batenin and our observer Petr Vasilyev, have discussed the underlying reasons and consequences of this statement, and we now bring you the English transcript of their conversation.

[First announcer] President Gorbachev as I see it has displayed knowledge and readiness to hold a dialogue aimed at achieving mutually acceptable compromises. The idea itself is not new, though. To combine the all-European process and the drafting of the status for a united Germany: in these conditions there must inevitably be a transformaton of the military blocs, which cannot remain uninvolved in the political processes. Would you agree?

[Second announcer] NATO must be transformed in the spirit of the transformation of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, that is, both blocs must turn into some sort of new political military organization with new associated cooperative structures; operations, control, and evaluation of the strategic situation. In this case it is unimportant for us where united Germany will be, in which of the two structures, since both will be aimed at reaching similar mutually interrelated goals, thus ensuring collective security. By the way, these structures can become the forerunner of a future integrated structure of collective security. It is apparent that they must have political superstructures, for example a joint committee of chiefs of staff, as well as horizontal ties, both political and military.

[First announcer] But such transformations require basic changes in the structures of the military union. This applies first of all to the Warsaw Treaty Organization, with due account for the processes underway in Eastern Europe. The new type of (?list) must not be so much political as economic, scientific, technological, military, and technical.

[Second announcer] I quite agree with you. Exactly in such a case the issue what bloc united Germany is part of will disappear. (?For in very nature), functions and aims, both blocs will be following similar objectives. Besides that, the four victorious countries of the Second World War—the USSR, the United States, France and Britain—must hand their rights and powers over Germany to a wider forum of European states, and this may be the conference on security and cooperation in Europe.

[First announcer] Naturally this is not a one-time action, just as the process itself isn't. It has continuity in time, probably also has several stages in its evolution. The transitional period lasting several years could solve these tasks, I think, though the main thing is to synchronize the process of German unification and the all-European process.

[Second announcer] It is my opinion that the transitional period is the most dangerous one, because it is exactly the time when stability can be upset. A united Germany will of course choose its system itself, just as the way to act as regards its own security. Obviously, then, for the transitional period it is necessary to keep the status quo. The issue of neutrality or demilitarization of Germany disppears, since Germany finds itself disconnected from the political life of Europe, the more so that it is in the very center of the continent and the developments.

[First announcer] But there arises a question now: What is to be done with the military structures of the two Germanies that exist, function, and will keep playing a major role, as for example the West German army in NATO?

[Second announcer] As I've already said, for the transitional period it is necessary to keep the status quo. The operational space must be divided formally for the two armies to function in; the West German army and the

GDR national army in those lands that are defined by the present-day frontiers of the two Germanies.

[First announcer] And so the West German army will be part of NATO. It will have certain military and political functions within that alliance, while the national army of the GDR will be subordinate to the government of united Germany and that government is linked with NATO. How is it possible to solve this contradiction—if you do see a contradiction here?

[Second announcer] The central Government of Germany may be linked with NATO politically, but there are political commitments and agreements which can be reached at a sufficiently high level, for example under the two-plus-four formula. For the transitional period the agreements will enforce the status of the GDR army as one performing security functions without any integration into any alliances or armies. For certain periods the GDR army will still maintain ties with the Warsaw Treaty Organization as regards military and technical cooperation. There are sorts of combat vehicles, other armaments, and communications facilities which cannot be removed in one go, but it is necessary to take into account that within the framework of the Vienna talks on reducing troops and armaments in Europe, this army will be reduced and will reach the strength of the troops that are now available on the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, of the type of motherland protection troops. The West German army in its turn must be transformed together with NATO from the point of view of changing strategy and tactics, and its political use. But in any case, it is necessary to accept the possibility of the West German army's existence in NATO, said general Geliy Batenin.

[First announcer] The initial reaction to the statement by President Gorbachev is that united Germany has to be full-fledged member of NATO. It should be noted, though, that the West, for one official statement by the NATO press secretary for Radio Moscow, speak of a need to have a constructive search for mutually acceptable compromise decision. During her recent visit to Moscow the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher declared she agreed with the need to take into account Moscow's concern over the one-sided solution of the issue of Germany's NATO membership. A search for mutually acceptable compromises is possible, as we see it, along the path of drawing closer together and dissolving the borders of the two military blocs, which could become in a perspective the basis for a collective system of security in Europe.

'New Structures' Proposed To Replace Blocs

LD1406093890 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—If the system of blocs in Europe is discarded and replaced with new structures to maintain stability, most important European problems can be resolved, and the military-political status of a united Germany can be determined, states a declaration adopted at a meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee on June 7 in Moscow.

If the opposing military blocs in Europe are brought closer and if these alliances are reformed in connection with the Vienna and all-European processes, the associate membership of a united Germany in the two alliances would be viewed differently. Germany could serve as a bridge to ensure mutual understanding between the two blocs as long as NATO and the Warsaw Treaty exist.

At a meeting on June 12 the Soviet parliament expressed hope that the North Atlantic Alliance will adequately react to the declaration of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee, aimed at overcoming military confrontation in Europe.

NATO has responded to the Political Consultative Committee's decisions. Participants in the two-day session of the NATO council in Turnberry welcomed the "positive spirit" of the Political Consultative Committee declaration.

For the first time the final document issued by leaders of NATO countries has not contained direct mention of the "military menace from the East". [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1405 GMT on 13 June adds the following sentence: "Not one NATO communique in the past four decades has abounded in such optimistic appraisals of the various aspects of international relations as the Turnberry document."] This singularly optimistic NATO assessment of international relations undoubtedly is a result of changes that have taken place in the world since 1985.

What is more, NATO foreign ministers proclaimed in Turnberry their readiness for "reasonable compromise" at the Vienna talks and said they instructed their delegations in Vienna to try new approach towards achieving mutually acceptable solutions. They also stated NATO's intentions to alter its military strategy. This is also an encouraging sign.

The session of the NATO council and the conference of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee were held almost simultaneously and discussed similar matters. Both forums adopted final documents reflecting the alliances' attitudes to the most important military and political problems.

The Warsaw Treaty countries pointed out that it is possible to discard the security system ensured by blocs and decided to transform their alliance. In the course of one year they intend to switch the emphasis to politics and to change the alliance's structure in accordance with the defensive doctrine that has already been worked out and endorsed.

It is not precluded that NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation will exist for a certain period, perhaps a lengthier period than many expect now.

Warsaw Treaty countries have a right to expect that NATO will start a similar process and meet it half-way.

However, in Turnberry, NATO ministers confirmed that the fundamental principles of the North Atlantic Alliance remain unchanged. The Parisian newspaper LIBERATION notes that many Western countries do not support NATO's becoming a purely political alliance. They insist that NATO should become the cornerstone of the new European order and that the functions of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe supplement NATO's functions.

It is to be hoped that this is not NATO's last word about changing NATO's military structure and that the July session of the NATO council at the summit level, to be held in London, will adopt decisions to change the bloc's military strategy, shifting the emphasis to politics.

Turnberry NATO Council Session Assessed

PM1306120090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Report by special correspondents A. Lyutyy, V. Peresada: "In the Ruins of Turnberry Castle"]

[Text] Turnberry, Scotland, June—In recent days the North Sea [as published] has behaved as if trying to justify its austere name. On the Scottish coast the wind roared and raged and a cold, slanting rain cut into you. It looked as if the huge canvas marquee that had been erected in the coastal village of Turnberry for the NATO Council session would not stand up to it. The foreign ministers of the countries belonging to the North Atlantic alliance, shivering and ignoring diplomatic conventions, climbed out of their Rolls Royces and ran for the tent at a trot. Hundreds of journalists who had to leave their cars at a distant parking lot because of security measures, executed a kind of cross-country run, leaping across puddles and trying not to fall into the mud.

At the press center the correspondents were asking each other: why did they have to hold the session out in the sticks and install everything here temporarily—from communications networks to toilets? Why Turnberry? None of the journalistic fraternity could answer this question and NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner, whom we also asked, advised us to ask the British side.

Margaret Thatcher clarified the situation by explaining at the session that the choice of venue was no accident. It is associated with the role played by Turnberry Castle in ancient times as a "forward defense line" and "deterrent factor." According to M. Thatcher, the symbolic lessons of this role should be of some use to the North Atlantic alliance today. So the geography of the meeting, as proposed by the hosts, had a clear meaning which was intended to be associated with the strategy of military confrontation and NATO's traditional doctrines.

For one of the authors of this report who works in London, this symbolism was not all that surprising. Changes in Britain's military policy are taking place more slowly than in the other NATO countries. The other, who arrived here from Brussels where NATO headquarters is situated, is familiar with different sentiments within the organization. Earlier sessions of the ministers and various committees of the North Atlantic alliance and the documents adopted there have shown that the former approaches to relations with the East are changing within NATO, the emphasis is shifting from the military sphere of the alliance's activity to the political sphere, and there is even an intention to review its strategy in the light of the changes in the Soviet Union and East Europe.

What kind of a landmark did the Turnberry meeting prove to be?

We do not want to exaggerate, but we must admit that its results were to a significant degree unexpected not only to us but literally to all the journalists who came here, many of whom we talked with. In what way? Primarily because of the unprecedented firmness with which NATO came out in favor of abandoning confrontation and going over to a policy of partnership with the East, first and foremost the Soviet Union.

This was reflected in the final communique. The well-known British journalist Hella Pick called it "very unusual" while Mariusz Kuklinski, our colleague from the Polish agency PAP, called it "striking." "I never thought such a document would be seen in NATO," he said to us.

The communique begins with a preamble headed "The Message of Turnberry." This is what it says: "We consider it necessary to use the historic opportunities that have arisen, as a result of the profound changes in Europe, in order to help create a new peaceful order on the continent based on freedom, justice, and democracy. Moved by this desire, we extend to the Soviet Union and all European countries the hand of friendship and cooperation..."

What is the meaning of this major claim by NATO to a renewal of its policy with regard to the East? What practical steps do the 16 member countries of the alliance intend to take to this end? Judging by the communique and the statements made by ministers at the press conference, several avenues are emerging.

First in the political sphere. The all-European process is described as the most important instrument for ensuring security and cooperation on the continent and its role, NATO believes, should be stepped up. Particular significance is attached to the convening this year of a summit conference of the 35 CSCE states, and subsequently the formation of permanent institutions of the all-European

process. The "new peaceful order" on the continent, the communique stresses, should take into account the interests of all the European states including the Soviet Union.

At the same time the concept of this "order," although worthy of attention, itself prompts questions. After all, the suggestion is that the future all-European security structure should be only an addition, a kind of "umbrella" to cover the existing structures in which the key role would belong to NATO. Can we assume, in that case, that the necessary balance of interests on the continent will actually be ensured?

The convening of the conference of the 35 is regarded as directly associated with the signing of an agreement on reducing conventional arms and armed forces in Europe. This agreement is assessed as a very important stage along the path to further disarmament and the lowering of the level of military confrontation. In particular, readiness is expressed to commence talks on reducing short-range nuclear weapons immediately after it is signed. Incidentally, the question of modernization of these weapons, which was for many years an invariable item on the agenda at such meetings, was not broached at all on this occasion.

And here is an interesting point. The Western press has recently been writing more and more frequently about Washington's plan to compensate for the renunciation of modernization by siting in Western Europe a new generation of tactical "air-to-surface" nuclear missiles, which it proposes to install on aircraft capable of penetrating deep into Soviet territory. London supports this plan while a number of other NATO countries have adopted a restrained attitude. The FRG's stance is of particular significance in connection with its strategic position and the problem of German unification. And Bonn, it became known to us at the session, intends to refuse to deploy these missiles on FRG territory.

The course and results of the session were influenced greatly by the Soviet-American summit meeting that took place just beforehand. Here it was noted repeatedly that the summit gave a new boost to East-West relations and made it possible to maintain the dynamics of the disarmament process. One "focus of attention" in Turnberry was U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, who was well and truly showered with questions about the talks between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush. The final communique expresses the hope that the progress achieved on the question of reducing Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive arms will lead to further developments in this direction, and that the accords on chemical weapons will lead to a complete ban on them. And all this will have a beneficial effect on the political climate in the world, particularly in Europe.

A completely new feature for meetings of this kind was the NATO statement on the expediency of contacts with the Warsaw Pact Organization. This has not previously been said in any NATO document. On the contrary, the alliance leadership has tried to avoid the subject. And while the possibility of establishing relations has begun to be acknowledged recently, it has only been a question of relations with individual Warsaw Pact countries, including the Soviet Union, and not with the organization as a whole which has been described as having virtually "disintegrated" in connection with the changes in East Europe.

All the same, a realistic view prevailed. NATO has at last responded to the repeated calls for collaboration from the Warsaw Pact. The participants in the Turnberry meeting welcomed the statement made in Moscow on 7 June by the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, and in particular the "wish for constructive cooperation which it expresses." "This is evidence of a change in NATO's approach to the Warsaw Pact," I. Glover-James, political observer for the SUNDAY TIMES newspaper, told us. "An awareness has evidently emerged that in the interests of stability on the continent, it is more important for the North Atlantic alliance to deal not with a fragmented East Europe but with an alliance of states in whose activity the military aspect is increasingly giving way to the political."

Let us observe that the question of NATO's relations with the Warsaw Pact was perhaps the most complex at Turnberry. Behind closed doors, the U.S. secretary of state briefed his colleagues on how it was raised and discussed at the Soviet-American summit meeting. We learned from sources close to the American delegation that the question provoked disputes and revealed an ambivalent approach on the part of the participants in the session. That is probably why the communique contains only a general phrase on the desire to "develop political contacts at all levels." And it is not yet clear how NATO intends to act in practice.

When the participants in the session dispersed after the final sitting, you could not help noticing the very depressed appearance of FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher. And that is only natural because a no less complex subject than that of NATO's relations with the Warsaw Pact was the question of German unification and its consequences for European stability. Characteristically, the session tried to take into account the concern and anxiety felt in this connection outside the bloc. While confirming the now familiar line on the incorporation of a united Germany into NATO, the participants in the session also noted the need to guarantee "the Soviet Union's legitimate security interests."

What specifically is meant by this? We asked Manfred Woerner, secretary general of the North Atlantic alliance, to answer this question.

"There are several aspects," he said. "First, we are prepared to refrain from extending NATO's sphere of activity beyond what is now FRG territory. Second, we are prepared to agree to the presence of Soviet troops on what is now GDR territory during a transitional period

on which Germany and the USSR would reach agreement. Third, the FRG has already stated clearly that a united Germany will not have nuclear, chemical, or bacteriological weapons. Fourth, the disarmament process in the 'conventional sphere' which limits troop strengths everywhere, will also apply to Germany's armed forces. Finally, there is another basic element. It is our vision of the future European security architecture, which must include the Soviet Union, and our desire for stability for everyone without exception. I think the Soviet Union can only gain from this."

We believe it is not only politicians who are asking today: what place will a united Germany take in the European system of coordinates? Will the positions of the leading Western states and the Soviet Union, which is opposed to its membership of NATO, be reconciled? How acceptable are the guarantees in question? Judging by our conversations at Turnberry, people in NATO realize that verbal assurances alone are not enough, that a careful study of all aspects of the problem is needed at the "two-plus-four" talks and at bilateral and multilateral meetings. An optimum formula must be developed for Germany's future military-political status such that the Soviet Union does not feel that there will be a change in the military balance on the continent to its detriment.

The meeting in Scotland is not just another NATO Ministerial session. It is the last stage before the July conference of leaders of the alliance countries which is to take place in the British capital. At Turnberry a whole range of proposals was drafted on NATO policy in the new conditions and these will be made public at the London conference.

Of course many aspects of NATO's strategy, both political and military, remain unchanged as yet. For instance, Europe's future security is not envisaged without a NATO military component, although a significant politicization of the alliance is proposed. It is still deemed necessary to keep American nuclear and conventional forces on the continent and strenghthen Atlantic solidarity which, even in the new conditions, means maintaining a substantial U.S. military influence in Europe.

All the same, despite this people here are already talking about the "spirit of Turnberry." It seems that the symbolism of the venue proposed by the British side did not work. Turnberry today has become, perhaps, a symbol of an entirely different nature. It would be nice to hope that the ruins of Turnberry Castle, not far from where the tent was pitched, will become the ruins of prejudice and fear, distrust and enmity—those attributes of the cold war that split our continent for decades. Mere ruins.

Army Role in Third World 'Arms Dealing' Viewed

PM1406132590 Moscow KRASAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Colonel General Ye. Smirnov, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Dokuchayev; place and date of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are introduction: "'We Are Not Arms Dealers'"]

[Text] Until recently it was not the custom to speak openly of the Soviet Union's military cooperation with the so-called "third world" countries. But the renewal which has affected our foreign policy course and all aspects of the life of Soviet society and the Army and Navy has also penetrated this sphere.

Our interlocutor is Colonel General Ye. Smirnov, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.

[Dokuchayev] Yevgeniy Kirillovich, the press is publishing an increasing number of items which touch to some degree or other on questions of the USSR's military cooperation with the developing countries. And the assessments given are not the most flattering. It is being said that since 1945 the Soviet Union has engaged in arms dealing and has interfered in the affairs of other countries. Our advisers and specialists have helped conduct combat operations on the ground and in the skies of Egypt, Syria, Angola, Vietnam, and Afghanistan.... I realize that we have rendered military aid at the request of these countries' legitimate governments, but in any case arms deliveries mean the aggravation of the situation in regions and the escalation of the arms race....

[Smirnov] A complex question. Political, military, and economic aspects of our state's activity in the international arena are closely interwoven in it. Obviously the reply to this question must also be given with a consideration for this approach.

...The sixties and seventies. The colonial system is collapsing. New states are appearing in the world arena. Understandably, the colonial powers have not been able and did not want to render aid to the liberated countries in the consolidation of their national security. That is why they turned to the Soviet Union for help.

It is scarcely possible to discern here interference by us in these countries' internal affairs. In all cases, I stress in all cases, military cooperation was effected at the request of the governments of foreign states on the basis of article 51 of the UN Charter which provides for the inalienable right of states to individual and collective self defense. We often did not satisfy all requests for military aid if we saw that this could lead to the complication of the situation in the country or region.

Our military aid includes deliveries of arms and equipment and the dispatch of specialists to render assistance in mastering them. For instance Egypt, in addition to aircraft (MiG-21, SU-7B, and others) and air defense missile complexes, was supplied with a considerable number of tanks (over 2,500), field artillery pieces and mortars (over 5,000), and guided antitank missiles (about 1,000). All this was used exclusively for defense against an aggressor. For the Vietnamese People's Army, deliveries hinged on air defense missile and aviation equipment (aircraft of the MiG-21 type), that is equipment of a defensive nature. This enabled Vietnam to

create an air defense and air force which did away with the possibility of entering the republic's airspace with impunity.

When necessary, generals and officers were sent as military advisers to individual countries to resolve questions of building national armies and repelling outside aggression. Yes, in Egypt, Vietnam, and a number of other countries our servicemen took part in combat operations. But that was an enforced measure when the complicated combat equipment which we supplied, for instance air defense missile complexes, had not yet been mastered by the national military cadres and strikes were already being delivered against them.

In brief, military aid is not arms dealing but primarily an element of the Soviet state's foreign policy activity.

[Dokuchayev] But what about Afghanistan. After all, even the Supreme Soviet and Congress of USSR People's Deputies gave a negative assessment of this war. The opinion is common in the world that Afghan was for the Soviet Union what Vietnam was for the Americans.

[Smirnov] The Congress of People's Deputies stated that it was the decision to bring our troops into Afghanistan and not the actions of our army which deserved moral and political condemnation. Surely the stay of the limited contingent of Soviet troops cannot be compared with U.S. aggression in Vietnam? They brought in up to 0.5 million soldiers, eight full divisions, and 52 squadrons of combat aircraft (over 1,000 aircraft) including 90 heavy bombers. We did not conduct large-scale combat operations. Even according to the assessments of Western military specialists, our troops' numerical strength (as of 15 May 1988 there were 100,300 Soviet servicemen in Afghanistan) was sufficient only to guard and ensure the functioning of communications. And later, risking their lives, our boys delivered bread, flour, and medical supplies to Kabul and other cities.... Do aggressors behave like that?

You have to distinguish between assessments of the introduction of troops and assessments of our army's actions on Afghan soil.

[Dokuchayev] In December last year USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy informed the United Nations of the numerical strength of the Soviet Armed Forces outside the country—it is 627,500 men. The fact attests to the high standard of our openness in the military sphere. But in my view questions connected with the presence of military advisers and specialists abroad are not given sufficient coverage. The press continues to note instances of the presence of a considerable number of Soviet servicemen abroad and their participation in combat operations, in Ethiopia for instance....

[Smirnov] In foreign states there are collectives of Soviet military advisers and specialists of varying numerical strength. To safeguard the activity of some of them, the minimum necessary technical (communications and transport) subunits have been sent. In the middle of the eighties the number of advisers and specialists was about 10,000. Considering the new approaches toward cooperation and the training of highly skilled national military cadres in the USSR, the numerical strength of advisers and specialists abroad has now been more than halved. Alongside the reduction, their tasks and functions are changing and greater emphasis is placed on rendering aid in the high-quality mastering of the weapons supplied.

As for the participation of advisers and specialists in combat operations, our position now is unequivocal—not to allow it. Neither in Angola nor in Ethiopia nor in other countries where combat operations are bein conducted are Soviet servicemen taking part in them. This question is specially stipulated in the relevant intergovernment agreements. The fact that three Soviet military specialists were taken prisoner in Ethiopia in 1988 is not evidence that they were taking part in combat operations. They were captured during a sudden attack by Eritrean separatists on the garrison in which they were working.

[Dokuchayev] Are there Soviet servicemen serving under the UN flag?

[Smirnov] In October 1979 the UN secretary general asked the Soviet Government to assign 36 officers to serve in the UN organ for observing the fulfillment of the truce terms in Palestine as UN military observers. The activity of the organ for observing the fulfillment of the truce terms in Palestine covers the territory of five states—Israel, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon. Right now our observers are in Egypt, Syria, and Jordan. The leader of the organ for observing the fulfillment of the truce terms in Palestine in Syria is the Soviet officer N. Trofimov.

We also have a positive attitude toward participation in the material and technical backup of UN operations to maintain peace in various regions.

[Dokuchayev] You spoke of the reduction in the numerical strength of military specialists outside the USSR. But what is your position on questions of restricting deliveries and sales of weapons? Thus, a special report prepared by a U.S. Congress study group points out that over the course of 1988 the USSR sold the developing countries weapons worth $9.9 billion while the United States sold them weapons worth $9.2 billion. Why should we not announce the quantitative and qualitative composition of the combat equipment shipped abroad as the Western countries do, for instance?

[Smirnov] It should be confirmed that the volumes of weapons deliveries from the United States and the USSR remain substantial. In the seventies and eighties the export of weapons from Britain, the FRG, France, and Italy increased substantially. A fierce struggle for sales markets has developed among Western weapons suppliers.

The Soviet Union is in favor of reducing volumes of weapons supplies on a basis of reciprocity with the West and supports UN initiatives in this field. In 1989 we suspended weapons deliveries to Nicaragua. We have repeatedly suggested to Washington that we mutually reduce arms deliveries to the zones of other military conflicts (Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia) right up to their complete cessation. But so far there has been no due understanding from the U.S. side. This is evidently caused by the West's desire, considering its political and economic interests, to leave open any channels for deliveries of modern weapons "to friendly governments" in various parts of the world.

As for the publication of data on weapons exports, the Soviet Union is now taking an active part within the UN framework in the development of a register of international arms sales and deliveries.

In addition, competent Soviet organs are working on the question of publishing some specific information on Soviet military cooperation, including volumes of weapons export deliveries.

[Dokuchayev] In April 1987, at the United States' suggestion, the seven leading capitalist states introduced restrictions on the export to the developing countries of missiles with a range of over 300 km and a payload of over 500 kg and also on the transfer of technology for their production. And what is our position here? To this day there is a din over the Soviet Union's foreign deliveries of the "Scud" missiles used in the "war of the cities" in the Iran-Iraq conflict.

[Smirnov] In the field of missile weapons deliveries the Soviet Union steers a comprehensively considered line. Missiles with the specifications you have mentioned are not delivered abroad by us and the technology for their production has not been passed on.

Yes, the Soviet side did supply Iraq with missiles with a range of under 300 km. Their use was in accordance with the national command's plans. But to assert that it was these missiles which were used to destroy Iranian cities would be wrong. In the "war of the cities" Iraq used missiles of greater range—up to 600 km.

As for Iran, it has not been supplied with any Soviet missile weapons.

With a view to ending the "war of the cities," at the Soviet Union's initiative this question was examined in the UN Security Council in 1988 and other measures were taken on a bilateral basis.

[Dokuchayev] Some observers and journalists criticize not the actual process of arms exports but rather its burdensome and ineffective nature for our budget. Formulas are suggested for selling military equipment, including that released in the process of the reduction of the Armed Forces, and it is predicted that the largest flood of weapons for decades is on the point of surging abroad....

[Smirnov] We are not dealers on the weapons market. As I have already argued, the term "arms dealing" in the literal sense is not appropriate to deliveries of our arms. At the same time I want to note that the Soviet Union's expenditure on arms deliveries is offset in full and the state obtains substantial currency funds and essential commodities.

The flow of Soviet weapons abroad after the signing of the treaty on the reduction of conventional arms in Europe will not be a surge and the Soviet Union does not intend to do this. The agreements provide for the implementation of a strict accounting for military equipment subject to reduction and the monitoring of its destruction or reequipping for civilian use. At the same time the Western press asserts that the United States is already seeking to sell other countries part of the arms from its European grouping subject to reduction under this treaty.

In concluding our talk I should like to stress that, in implementing perestroyka in military building, the Soviet Union is geared toward new approaches in its implementation based on the principles of compliance with the new political thinking in the international arena, reasonable defense sufficiency, and economic expediency.

United States & Canada

Cheney's 'Ambiguous' Speech Assessed

LD1406212290 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS political observer Aleksandr Antsiferov]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—A speech made by U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney at a conference of the American-Israeli Political Action Committee, held in the U.S. capital recently, produces an ambiguous impression. There is no denying the fact that it contains a realistic assessment of Soviet-American relations and the world situation in general after the Washington summit.

According to Cheney, the talks in Washington reflected history-making changes that took place in East Europe and the Soviet Union during the past year. He said that the relations between the two superpowers had obviously been put on a new basis, that now they can state with confidence that the Warsaw Treaty is no longer a dangerous military alliance, and NATO's fear of a sudden Soviet invasion of West Europe has considerably reduced.

One can only welcome the reduction of fear, well-grounded or invented. However, Cheney probably decided to make up for this assessment, at least partially, by mentioning some threat to U.S. vital interests, coming if not from Europe, then from other parts of the world.

The only purpose of it is to justify the need for further U.S. military buildup, primarily the preservation of the "Star Wars" programme, whose official name is the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI).

It turned out that the threat is coming from Third World countries, some of which will be able, according to forecasts, to produce ballistic missiles and mass destruction weapons by the year 2000.

Undoubtedly, the world community has every reason to be concerned over the spreading of the arms race, including the most deadly weapons, to developing countries. However, the impression is that Cheney is confusing the cause and the consequence. Actually, the accumulation and spreading of weapons throughout the world, which is fraught with the threat of regional conflicts, was the result of an atmosphere of hostility and confrontation dividing nations and worsening the world situation. It is also worth mentioning that the SDI was both the result of the "cold war" and an important component part of the arms race, which kept the programme afloat and at the same time profited from it.

Those who support the most ruinous, dangerous and odious military programmes like the SDI, regarding it as a means of stopping the spreading of mass destruction weapons in the world, either stick to illusions, or are trying to dupe public opinion.

According to a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, Cheney's recommendations run counter to the agreements reached during the Washington summit by the Soviet and American leaders. It is possible to stop military buildup in Third-World countries only by means of talks, by the quest for political solutions to regional problems, and not through bringing the arms race to the space level.

If the SDI changes its direction towards developing countries, it will still remain a factor destabilising world peace and security.

Foreign Ministry Officials View U.S. Relations

LD1306192390 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 13 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Leonid Timopheyev]

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS—The public must know what is happening in foreign policy and have a say. This idea keynoted the recent meeting of representatives of the Soviet Foreign Ministry and the Soviet public which was held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry press centre today.

In an informal and open exchange, Eduard Maloyan, head of the U.S. and Canada Department, and Andrey Kozyrev, head of the international organisations department, dwelt on the key issues of Soviet-U.S. relations in the context of the recent meeting between the Soviet and U.S. presidents, and difficulties which arose before and during the meeting.

The two men examined in detail various aspects of numerous agreements signed by the leaders of the two countries in Washington, including their practical implementation. For example, the agreement on shipping which the sides negotiated for ten years will allow Soviet merchant vessels to call at U.S. ports, bypassing a number of onerous formalities.

Computers of the firm control data, which have been considered top secret until recently and will be delivered to the Soviet Union as part of the agreement, will help raise the safety of Soviet nuclear power plants, in which the Soviet public shows keen interest.

Generally, it was stressed that the recent meeting between Gorbachev and Bush became the "latest" contribution to undoing the "image of the enemy" which for years was artificially cultivated in relations between the two states. All this cannot but affect relations between Soviet and U.S. peoples, which come to increasingly shape the policy of their governments with every year.

The importance of this meeting, Kozyrev stressed, goes far beyond the framework of bilateral relations: It will give powerful impetus to all modern political processes, help renew the international climate on the whole.

In the course of the meeting the two men replied to many questions from the representatives of the Soviet public.

Bush Welcomes Talks With Baltic Leaders

PM1406153190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Hopeful Sign"]

[Text] The foreign mass media and foreign officials assess the exchange of opinions taking place between President Gorbachev and the chairmen of the Supreme Soviets of the three Baltic republics as a hopeful sign of progress toward a mutually acceptable resolution of the problem.

President Bush stated at a ceremony in the White House that he is encouraged by M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with the leaders of the Baltic republics. "I think that this is an encouraging development," he said. "I hope it will lead to the next step on the road to self-determination for the Baltic region. We want dialogue to continue, and President Gorbachev knows that he and I have disagreements over the status of Lithuania and that we have never recognized its incorporation in the Soviet Union."

Reportage, Commentary on Gorbachev Visit

Summit Results Reflected

PM1106092190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Observer Manki Ponomarev commentary under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Opinions": "New Horizons"]

[Text] You will recall that in my article on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit, which was also called "On the Eve," I wrote that no matter what complexities arose in its path, we could expect the USSR and U.S. leaders to vindicate the peoples' hopes. Well, today we can say that these hopes have in many ways been vindicated.

USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's state visit to the United States and his talks with the U.S. President in the past few days were a key event in world politics. Why? Because the Washington summit was of truly great significance not just for bilateral relations, but also for the whole international system. If you look at its results in a broad context, it is obvious that the summit demonstrated the strengthening of mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States and progress in the main spheres of the profound positive changes taking place in the world. New prospects of a general improvement in the international climate opened up. And this has created an atmosphere in which the most complex and intricate problems can be fruitfully discussed and successfully resolved.

In this connection I would first like to point out a fundamental political achievement: the Soviet-U.S. trade agreement. As part of a package with a number of other agreements—on trade in grain, cooperation in the sphere of civil aviation, maritime shipping, peaceful nuclear energy, and science and education—it underpins the whole system of Soviet-U.S. relations with a solid material foundation. Now not only the political will of the two countries' leaders, but also the vital economic interests of their peoples will demand growing business-like and constructive cooperation.

In what way is this agreement important? In that it is connected with granting the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status, of which our country was stripped in 1951 and whose absence means that Soviet goods are liable in the United States to duty that is sometimes 10 times greater than that on goods from other countries and that trade between our two countries is at an extremely low level. Admittedly, President G. Bush did not hide the fact that he will not present the agreement to Congress for ratification (and without this it cannot come into force) until the law on exit is adopted in the Soviet Union. As is well known, it has already been discussed by the USSR Supreme Soviet during its first reading.

The fact that the U.S. President has started the normalization of trade relations with the USSR in a period of profound change in the Soviet economy, on which the fate of the whole of perestroyka depends, has a special meaning. Observers have assessed it as a vote of confidence in the Soviet leadership. The vote is all the more important in that many crocodile tears have recently been shed in the West about the "weakness of Gorbachev's position," the fact that the Washington summit did not manage to "resolve the German question," and so on and so forth.

What can be said about this? Television has made us all eyewitnesses of and participants in what has been happening across the ocean. And we all saw the dignity and confidence with which the Soviet leader behaved in America—in the talks with G. Bush, in conversations with congressmen, and in meetings with representatives of business circles, the intelligentsia, the public, and ordinary Americans in the street. How could anyone talk about "weakness" here?

And as for the problems connected with German unification and the European process as a whole, then yes, differences in the sides' positions remain here. But they were examined in depth and compared, and new arguments and new viewpoints appeared. The sides are prepared to continue the discussion in the quest for solutions. However, these problems could not be resolved behind the backs of other countries and peoples. The mechanism based on the "two-plus-four" formula exists for this purpose and there are other states which are also interested in ensuring that the solution of the problems of German unification and their external aspects organically fit in with the all-European process and promote the strengthening of universal security.

The Soviet Union is prepared to discuss any options, whatever their source. And this creative work has already begun. In this connection I would like to draw attention to the interesting—in my opinion—initiative on the part of the Hamburg Institute for Peace and Security Problems, which has not yet been covered in the columns of the Soviet press. The institute has elaborated a model for a "security association" in central Europe. This association, including a united Germany, could be an alternative to other ideas about its future military-political status. This would be a regional system of collective security which would not infringe anyone's interests and which would open up real prospects for the creation of an all-European system.

A number of agreements were signed in Washington and binding statements were made on certain key aspects of the reduction and elimination of arms—both mass destruction and conventional arms.

The agreement on the destruction and nonproduction of chemical weapons stands out among them. Speaking about its significance, R. Michel, leader of the Republican minority in the U.S. House of Representatives, noted: "Had this been the only thing signed at the summit, it would have been enough to regard the meeting as a success."

Yes, this is true. The reaching of this agreement is all the more astonishing, as THE NEW YORK TIMES noted, since it will be very difficult to verify compliance with its provisions. And this means that a high degree of trust has been achieved. It is planned that, starting in late 1992, the USSR and the United States will destroy 80 percent of their chemical weapons over a period of 10 years—to a level of 5,000 tonnes on each side—and they will give up producing them. And then, after the adoption of the universal convention on banning chemical weapons whose elaboration is nearing completion, they will renounce them altogether.

The Soviet and U.S. delegations at the talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva were unable to complete the elaboration of the treaty on the radical reduction of strategic offensive weapons before the beginning of the summit. It was quite impossible to resolve some questions. They included, among others, the question of mobile ICBM's. This was resolved in Washington. The presidents agreed that the number of warheads on such missiles must not exceed 1,100 within the framework of the general reduction, and they agreed on procedures for the verification of mobile ICBM's, which had also been a stumbling block.

Admittedly, some obstacles still remain on the path to signing the treaty on strategic offensive arms. Thus the United States is trying to sell the same cow twice, so to speak. As is well known, at its insistence, the Soviet Tu-22M "Backfire" medium bomber was included as a subject of the talks on conventional forces in Europe which are being held in Vienna. But the United States is also trying to include it in the category of strategic arms. Back in 1979 the Soviet Union stated that it would not give this aircraft the properties of an intercontinental range, and therefore it could not be included in the strategic category. The Soviet Union is prepared to reaffirm this pledge today. But no more than that.

The second obstacle is the problem of tests of heavy missiles. The USSR now has 308 such missiles. We are prepared to halve the number of them to 154 but reserve the right to test launches. The United States objects. Both Soviet and U.S. specialists and scientists obviously have work to do here to determine the borders between permissible modernization and a qualitative arms race.

Finally, the problem of noncircumvention of the treaty remains unresolved. The United States asserts that it has a program of cooperation with Britain and within its framework can give Britain any kind of strategic weapons—"Trident" ballistic missiles, intercontinental missiles, cruise missiles, and so on. But this makes the whole treaty on strategic offensive arms meaningless. What does the reduction in U.S. arms change if the arms are merely transferred to Britain?

All these questions are serious. But a solution to them can be found. A joint statement was issued in Washington on the basic provisions of the future agreement on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive arms. It makes it possible to hope that a treaty can be signed before the end of 1990, as the two presidents agreed in Malta. And meanwhile, the basic parameters for the future talks on nuclear and space arms—strategic offensive arms-2, as they are called—have been outlined.

Of course, I have been able to dwell on only some of what I see as the most important aspects of the results of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush and to comment on only part of what was achieved. The time for a full interpretation lies ahead. We are still waiting impatiently for the Soviet leader's report on the results of his visit to the United States, which he will reportedly deliver at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. But it is already obvious that the summit was not just a search for answers to the challenges of the times. It provided the answers to many of them.

'Mutual Trust' Seen as Gain

PM1106110190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Special correspondent Tomas Kolesnichenko dispatch under rubric "This Is What Happened in Washington": "When Mountains Meet"]

[Excerpts] Washington-Moscow—The days of our lives fly by quickly, too quickly. The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is now receding from us, as if at cosmic speed, into history. It is rather strange to experience all of this—yesterday I was in the thick of events, spending sleepless nights as a correspondent (like all our journalists billeted in Washington's Vista Hotel), and today I

can already take a detached, as it were, of what happened. Nothing can be added or taken away. That is the way history is made, to be sure.

History will pass the final verdict on this event that kept the whole world on edge for a week. There will be time for analytical articles to be written and for the results to be scrupulously summed up. I believe that observers will come back time and again to the six days (30 May-4 June) of M.S. Gorbachev's 1990 U.S. visit. But that is all still in the future. I now want to offer you some lines and observations in chronological order which for various reasons remained in my notebook and were not included in the joint reports I and my colleagues made from Washington.

...Roughly a week before the meeting began in New York I was received by the leadership of THE NEW YORK TIMES and NEWSWEEK magazine. The newspaper people were still talking calmly. They had time for discussion and forward reflection. But people at NEWSWEEK were clearly jumpy: After all, their magazine was to come out (how about that for American promptness!) 4 June—that is, the day when M.S. Gorbachev was to leave Washington. But it is well known that "noblesse oblige." This date obliged them to comment on the meeting between the USSR and U.S. leaders in advance, as it were. Thus, everything, both during my conversations at the editorial office and in the actual 4 June edition of NEWSWEEK, boiled down to the idea that the Soviet president would, regrettably, have an extremely hard time of it this time. They did not predict the meeting's success. The magazine claimed that never before had a leader looked as weak on the eve of a summit meeting with the U.S. President. The general conclusion was that domestic problems had sapped M.S. Gorbachev's strength. G. Bush, who allegedly "has to satisfy right-wing Republicans" would, of course, take advantage of this. In short, "the summit will undoubtedly be useful but it will not justify both sides' hopes."

Reverberations of these statements, as it were, reached another part of the globe. For instance, a French LE MONDE correspondent wrote from Washington at that time: "The man who is about to meet Bush no longer represents the second superpower." There were of course a considerable number of opposing forecasts and rejoinders—but no longer in the press itself—they could be heard in Washington among professionals, people with a profound understanding of the problems involved in Soviet-U.S. relations which are so difficult. They—and perhaps they alone—were talking at that time about "restrained optimism" and "reasonable compromise."

Well, these words were voiced here in the U.S. capital with extreme naturalness. After all, strictly speaking, Washington itself was founded as a result of political compromise. [passage omitted].

The Soviet "silver bird"—as we still love to write—touched down 30 May at Andrews base, and the talks began 31 May. There should probably be a small addition to our narrative here. Time for reflection, so to speak: What are summit meetings, and why are they held? There have been five USSR-U.S. meetings over the past few years. Journalists described some of them as "historic," and even "epoch-making." Is that an exaggeration? I think not. Such is their scale, such is the responsibility to our countries' peoples, to all mankind. The Washington meeting in 1987, for instance, changed all recent history if we bear in mind the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles alone. The "cold war" was buried on Malta during the meeting between the two leaders.

What could we expect this time? Highest-level meetings are called "summits" here, that is "mountain-top." Masses of people are indeed involved in them, intensive preparations are carried out, and a large number of agreements are worked out in detail. All that, as it were, forms layers in the agenda... As if two mountains, two Mont Blancs were really moving toward one another. A man stands on each summit. How can they change anything—each of the "mountains," after all, represents well-regulated principles, recorded statements, and oft-repeated words circulated by the mass media throughout the world, and so on and so forth? But it turns out that they can change things. And a great deal at that. Above all because they are people with their own views, principles, and emotions. And the fate of the world may later depend on their relations, on how these few days—which are in principle drops in the endless ocean of time—develop. It is possible, of course, to rise above arms levels and sublevels, above banal technical computations for various types of weapons or, on the contrary, elevate these computations to the rank of principles and policy. It is possible to understand one another, understand one another in human terms. Trust one another, or part indignant and aggrieved, as happened once in the past with Kennedy and Khrushchev... In short, the personality element plays an extremely important role in contemporary diplomacy. It is, so to speak, a form of aerobatics. You may, for instance, sign a pile of documents—even important documents—and not reach agreement on fundamental issues. You may, regardless of the number of agreements signed, acquire the main, invaluable asset of mutual trust.

It soon became clear that it was this factor that determined the success of the 1990 Soviet-U.S. meeting. Mutual trust is not merely an emotion born out of personal charm. No, it represents mutual responsibility in the material form of concrete policy. Judge for yourselves: Nothing seems to have changed since that dull day when I clipped out articles from NEWSWEEK and other newspapers and journals that placed the emphasis on M.S. Gorbachev's "weakness" and other things of that kind. Yet a few days later the same press organs had changed their tune beyond recognition.

What is more, the actual atmosphere of the meeting changed after the first few days of talks. I will use the interesting metamorphosis in U.S. Vice President Dan

Quayle as an example. Even after Malta he spoke with extreme skepticism about the improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations. An NBC TV correspondent took advantage of this when interviewing Quayle on the trade agreement that unexpectedly crowned the talks. "As a representative of the right wing in the U.S. political spectrum you must be disappointed about this," the correspondent asked. D. Quayle answered in the negative. The following dialogue then ensued:

[Correspondent] You were one of the first to voice a skeptical opinion of Gorbachev's true intentions. You voiced your opinion on this subject after the Malta summit. Have you seen something this time that made you change this opinion?

[Quayle] This was my first meeting with President Gorbachev. There are still fundamental differences between our countries. But he is a man who wins people over, he is a very good politician. He is willing to hold talks on what, in his opinion, best accords with Soviet interests.

I really feel, I really believe that tension has lessened. I think that there have been changes in intentions over the last couple of years. But there are still a number of very fundamental, profound problems between our two countries that separate us. We must not forget that. [Quayle ends].

The following question arises: Why is this happening? There is, after all, the saying "mountains don't meet." But it turns out that they are meeting. Despite the ancient sage and, one would think, the laws of physics. Obviously other laws are at work here—both simple and complex laws.

Simple, because neckties could be taken off—as happened at Camp David, where G. Bush changed from an official negotiating partner into a hospitable host, the owner and driver of a small golf buggy. But also complex, since strenuous work, well-gauged compromises, and occasionally political insights lay behind these outward signs of "unconstraint." In Washington (perhaps, precisely in Camp David?) both leaders effectively decided to change the fundamental basis of Soviet-U.S. relations. And move on from confrontation and "deterrence" to a new—as G. Bush said—"era of lasting cooperation." Much of what happened at this meeting can be associated with the words "for the first time." Thus this was the first time that it was stated that both countries (not in sport, or in exchanges of artistic ensembles) are ready for joint activities and cooperation referring, for instance, to a problem like the Near East—thinking about this used to be impracticable. This was the first time—and this is truly "food" for Americanists!—that M.S Gorbachev had said that we regard the U.S. presence in Europe as a stabilizing international factor. An extremely important statement. Incidentally, D. Quayle cited it when asked why he trusted the Moscow guest.

Last—but perhaps this is one of the most important things—this was the first time that joint efforts to achieve worldwide stability had determined the essence of the present moment in the international arena rather than rivalry, struggle between "camps," and ideological differences. In other words, they were discussing something that we have gotten accustomed to hearing in terms of irritating stock phrases about "lasting world peace." But, seeing how the faces of "ordinary" Washington residents lit up when M.S. Gorbachev got out of his automobile at the first street he came to and spoke to people, we began to realize that they admire the Soviet president precisely for the contribution he has made to the process of creating a lasting peace. "It was a magnificent day, one of the best of my life," Rudy Perpich, governor of Minnesota, said after his meeting with M.S. Gorbachev. "My political career spans many years, but I do not remember people greeting a politician with such enthusiasm."

I will back up this statement with a few quotations from articles in the mass media of the time. Summing up the results of the talks, P. Jennings, who is perhaps the best-known U.S. television observer today, said the following: "Gorbachev and Bush have taken another important step toward establishing relations that will largely be based on cooperation. It is quite obvious that they have begun to have a better attitude to one another; that is the inalienable value of personal diplomacy."

B. Hume, a White House television correspondent, said the following in a report on the two presidents' press conference: "Both leaders stressed that their improved personal relations are the main achievement of this summit meeting. The president said that an agreement was reached with Gorbachev to hold more frequent unofficial meetings—possibly every year."

"At the end of the summit meeting its participants seemed to be, if not friends, then at least leaders with mutual respect," NBC's correspondent J. Cochrane said in a reportage on this subject.

If we count agreements that have been signed, the latest Soviet-U.S. meeting will hold first place. But we have already explained that this is not the main thing. In my view, the main thing is determined by two elements resulting from "personal diplomacy" and the increasing mutual trust between our countries. First, the attainment of a trade agreement, which has never occurred before. Second, the successful resolution of disarmament problems. How can this be, the reader may ask: After all, no strategic offensive arms treaty was signed. No, it was not. But it was decided in principle that this will happen this year. The main thing once again is not the agreement but the atmosphere that is developing around the most pressing problem of our day—the elimination of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

Nevertheless I would not like to lull the reader into a sense of euphoria. There are still difficulties. The U.S. leadership still fails to realize how painful and acute the German question is for us. It is a theoretical question for them, while for us it is a question of memories and grief in every Soviet family... There are also many other

difficulties. We have already written about them in our reports on the summit meeting. I think that President G. Bush will not have it easy now. He has "left himself open," as they say in boxing, to an attack from critics on the right. Our president also still faces difficult domestic problems. But the main thing is that, like the earth before the dawn, the world has turned—albeit by just a fraction—toward the sun, toward a lasting peace. The USSR and U.S. presidents have decided to do business with one another. That is the very business which is so popular today. Americans described former U.S. President R. Reagan as the "great communicator." I believe that both presidents involved in the Soviet-U.S. summit of 1990 can claim this title.

Fishing Trawler Seized Off Canadian Shores

LD1006075590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Ottawa, 9 June. (TASS)—TASS correspondent Sergey Kuznetsov reports: A Soviet fighting trawler, the "Tantall" has been seized by Canada's fishing supervision authorities in the Atlantic off the shores of the province of Nova Scotia.

According to the claims of a representative of Canada's Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans, the trawler was fishing within the limits of Canada's 200-mile eonomic zone. All this time, a Canadian fishing inspector was on board.

The Soviet trawler was dispatched to the Canadian port of Halifax today. The ship and its catch have been impounded. The captain has been accused of catching lobsters in excess of the quota. In the event of his guilt being acknowledged, he is threatened with a fine of up to 100,000 Canadian dollars, confiscation of the catch, and loss of his license to fish in Canadian waters.

Canadian Navy Ships End Vladivostok Visit

LD0706090690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] The official visit to Vladivostok by a detachment of Canadian warships under the flag of Rear Admiral (Cearns), commander of the Pacific Ocean Fleet of the Canadian Navy, has ended. The destroyers (Huron) and (Cutney), the frigate Annapolis, and the tanker Provider left Zolotoy Rog Bay and set course for the shores of Canada.

China

Cooperation With PRC on Regional Issues Seen

OW1406110990 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Mikhaylov commentary]

[Text] In accordance with a memorandum on consultations between the Chinese and Soviet Ministries of Foreign Affairs, the first Sino-Soviet consultations on Asia-Pacific issues were held in Beijing. The two sides exchanged views on the overall situation in the Asia-Pacific region as well as on military, political, economic, and other issues in the region. The following is a commentary by station observer Mikhaylov:

The representatives of the two country's Ministries of Foreign Affairs held consultations in Beijing, a materialization of one of the agreements reached by Chinese Premier Li Peng during his recent visit to Moscow. At that time, a memorandum on consultations between the Soviet and Chinese Ministries of Foreign Affairs was signed, under which the two Foreign Ministries agreed to regularly exchange views on major international issues and issues of bilateral relations and to brief each other on their positions and viewpoints on international events.

Confrontation and a lack of dialogue between the Soviet Union and China over the past few decades caused tremendous losses to our countries, and they also caused losses to the people of other Asian countries. The tension between the two countries affected other countries and regions directly or indirectly. It prompted countries to engage in an arms race and also caused various clashes.

With the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations, achievements have also been made in stabilizing the situation in the Asia-Pacific region. This is not surprising. Today, the Soviet Union's and China's positions on international issues, including Asia-Pacific issues, are growing closer. The following example suffices to illustrate this point: In recent years, the delegates of the two countries to the United Nations have often held consultations, and the positions of the two countries have been identical on 80-90 percent of the votes in the United Nations.

The two sides have agreed to take measures to lower the level of military confrontation and to consolidate and develop various forms of cooperation in the region. The Soviet Union and China advocate a dialogue between North and South Korea, because they understand that true security for northeast Asia will not exist without a normalization of the situation on the Korean Peninsula. The scope of mutual understanding in seeking a political settlement of the Cambodia issue has been expanded, and the two countries also support the United Nations taking an active part in this process.

Of course, differences still exist between the two countries in their views on certain issues in the Asia-Pacific region. However, what is important is this: Although differences between them exist, the two biggest Asian countries are vigorously seeking ways to settle regional conflicts and to develop regional cooperation characterized by mutual benefit. I believe that regular Soviet-Chinese consultations on Asia-Pacific issues will promote considerably a positive settlement of such issues.

More on Ryzhkov-Liu Huaqing 'Friendly' Meeting

PM1506100190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Friendly Conversation"]

[Text] A meeting took place in the Kremlin 13 June between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Colonel General Liu Huaqing, deputy chairman of the PRC Central Military Council, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

During the conversation, which proceeded in a friendly atmosphere, the sides noted the successful development of Soviet-Chinese relations since the summit meeting in Beijing in May 1989 and the broadening of contacts and cooperation in various spheres on the basis of mutual trust, which is in the interests of both countries' peoples and helps to increase international stability and strengthen peace. Both sides expressed satisfaction with the implementation now underway of the accords reached during the visit to the Soviet Union in April 1990 by Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, on the development of cooperation in science, technology, and production, including aircraft construction and the peaceful use of outer space. Special attention was devoted to problems connected with conversion in the defense industry.

N.I. Ryzhkov described the main features of the present stage in perestroyka in the Soviet Union and ways to overcome the difficulties connected with society's transition to new living conditions. For his part, Liu Huaqing talked about the direction taken by political and socioeconomic development in the PRC and the Chinese people's desire to strengthen friendship with the Soviet people. He wished the Soviet side success in its implementation of radical transformations in the Soviet Union which accord with the socialist choice.

The conversation was attended by I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; USSR ministers A.S. Systsov and O.N. Shishkin; and Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. Present on the Chinese side were Yu Hongliang, Chinese ambassador to the Soviet Union; Shen Rongjun, first deputy chairman of the National Defense Science, Technology, and Industry Commission; Lin Zongtang, minister of the aerospace industry; and other officials.

CPSU Delegation Received by China's Qiao Shi

LD1506024190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1536 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Beijing, 14 Jun (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vladimir Kashirov reports:

China is prepared to go on developing interparty and interstate relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of the five principles of Peaceful coexistence and the four principles regulating party-to-party ties. This was stated by Qiao Shi, member of the Standing Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, when he received a CPSU delegation headed by A.S. Pavlov, head of the Department of State and Legal Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee, here today.

The communist parties of our countries, Qiao Shi said, maintained very good relations both before and after the foundation of the PRC in 1949. Later on our relations entered a difficult period, which ended after the meeting between Deng Xiaoping and M.S. Gorbachev last year. That was precisely when Sino-Soviet relations entered a new period of development.

During the conversation, the Chinese leader informed the Soviet guests about China's policy of reforms and expansion of external ties. During the 11 years this policy has been in force, he noted, China has achieved great successes in its development but, objectively speaking, we have certain shortcomings, and blunders have been committed. Therefore, we must quite seriously set about pooling our experience and drawing lessons from the mistakes which have been made.

China, Quiao Shi continued, is following events in the Soviet Union very closely. We wholeheartedly wish you success in the restructuring of your economic and political system along the road of socialist development.

For his part, A.S. Pavlov noted with satisfaction that the resumption and strengthening of friendly ties between the USSR and the PRC and between the peoples of the two countries were an inevitable, historical process. He expressed hope that Soviet-Chinese relations would develop further. There are good foundations and bright prospects for economic and political cooperation between our countries, he stressed.

Rogachev Speaks in Beijing on 'Cambodian Problem'

LD1406195390 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] The Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, Igor Rogachev, has suggested a compromise solution to the Cambodian problem. He told a news conference in Beijing that a Supreme National Council of Cambodia could be set up involving all of the conflicting sides. Together with the provisional administration, the council could run the country until general elections.

Northeast Asia

Pankin Leads Military Delegation to DPRK

SK1506041390 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "News on Cooperation" program under the "Annals of Friendship" program]

[Text] The Soviet military delegation led by Colonel General Valentin Pankin, first deputy commander-in-chief and chief of staff of the Soviet Air Force, visited the DPRK.

The delegation was received by Hong Son-yul, lieutenant general of the Korean People's Army. During the talks, discussions on the issue of concluding agreements with the armies of both countries and issues of mutual interest were carried out.

Friendship Society Forming Ties With ROK

WA1406172690 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 12 Jun 90 p 3

[Article by G. Ilin: "South Korea Is Getting Closer"]

[Text] A constituent assembly of the Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk Society for Friendship With the Republic of Korea has convened in the city. The aim of the new social organization established for the first time in the USSR is to develop all-encompassing ties of friendship, trust, mutual understanding, and cooperation between the population of Sakhalinsk Oblast and the Republic of Korea. Members of this society intend to facilitate the normalization of international-law relations between the USSR and South Korea, bearing in mind the prospects for restoration as swiftly as possible of diplomatic, consular relations, as well as for the expansion of trade, economic, cultural, and social ties.

Valeriy Pavlovich Pukhov, chairman of the Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk City Soviet of People's Deputies, was elected director of the new social organization. Pukhov was a seaman in the Far East Maritime Steamship Line, a member of the USSR Geographic Society, and a captain in the Navy Reserve.

The founders of the society include representatives of industrial and transportation enterprises and cooperatives, deputies of local soviets, and people's deputies of the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

Japan's Foreign Minister Confirms Improved Ties

SK1506041190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The Japanese Government sent a letter of appeal to the DPRK leadership for an improvement in bilateral ties.

Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama disclosed the sending of the letter in the Tokyo Diet. He said that after the historic high-level meeting between the Soviet Union and South Korea, a positive impact in this region had been forecasted and that the isolation of the DPRK may be all the more a barrier in the successful development of this process.

East Bloc Trade Ministers Meet in Ulaanbaatar

LD1206184690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1052 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By correspondent Dugar Sanzhiyev]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 12 Jun (TASS)—Today a second meeting started here between the heads of ministries of trade of Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and the CSFR. They are discussing the issues of improving the commodity circulation between their countries.

Ch. Purevdorj, deputy chairman of the MPR [Mongolian People's Republic] Council of Ministers, made a speech to the participants in the international meeting.

Near East & South Asia

Ivanov Assails Israel's 'Tougher' Policy

TA1406192890 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Oleg Ivanov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Following is the commentary by our commentator Oleg Ivanov on the first days of the new Israeli Government.

[Words indistinct] did it. After three months of a government crisis, he managed to form a narrow government based on a majority of 62 Knesset members. In the opinion of foreign observers this is the most extreme rightist government since the establishment of the state, even more radical than Begin's second government. Israel's policy toward the Palestinians will presumably reflect this by growing tougher. Shamir has already mentioned new methods to quash the intifadah, talked about establishing settlements, and more. It therefore appears that in every respect Israeli-Palestinian relations will worsen.

Shamir had a reason for picking up where he left off three months ago. In fact, he is digging in his heels even deeper in his rejectionist views. Perhaps oppression in the area will [word indistinct] in the near future. But in all honesty the Israeli (?Army) has already exhausted all the methods of combating the intifadah and has failed. (?That is because) what is involved is a popular uprising, it is impossible to stop it through oppression. It is only possible to do so through [words indistinct]. Even if the Likud now tries to implement the methods Sharon used in the Gaza Strip, and even if several dozen local leaders are assassinated, all this will be to no avail because the intifadah is not the rebellion of a certain organization, but of a people.

This leads to the conclusion that the problem that brought about the downfall of the previous Shamir government remains unsolved. The longer the new government attempts to maintain the status quo, the more the situation will deteriorate. This is the prime reason for

this government's weakness: The failure of Mr. Moshe Arens of the moderate Likud camp as the minister in charge of eliminating the intifadah will arouse Tehiya and Moledet's demands that methods even Yitzhaq Shamir did not venture to use.

In this context it would be appropriate to point out that Shamir's government enjoys a very slim majority. If the extreme right is disappointed and quits the government, it will fall. If the extreme right leaves the government over the policy in the territories, the moderate religious parties will likewise split, again leading to the dissolution of the government.

There is yet another process in the background: More and more Israelis are reaching the conclusion that it is impossible to continue to put off the dialogue with the Palestinians, and that it is not worthwhile to antagonize the United States. Everyone realizes that negotiations between the Palestinians and the Alignment are very feasible, whereas negotiations between the Palestinians and the Likud are a total impossibility.

It is consequently beneficial to note something else: the PLO factor. After 'Arafat worked out his political plan the Palestinians harbored the hope that it would be possible to reach some form of dialogue with Israel. Upon the establishment of a right-of-the-Likud government that hope was crushed. The depth of the disappointment matches the degree of hope that preceded it. Yasir 'Arafat is subjected to attacks by radicals from the right and the left. In the assessment of Swedish Foreign Minister Sten Andersson, his status will [word indistinct]. Is there anyone in the world interested in having the PLO return to the times of Al-Shuqayri [founder of the Palestine Liberation Army]? And is there anyone in Israel who wants the PLO to go back to the times of the fedayeen?

Israel's Refusal To Negotiate Criticized

LD1406143390 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Is Israel's new ultra-rightist government prepared to hold a dialogue with the Palestinians? Statements nullifying the emerging opportunity for talks have been made on two occasions this week. On Wednesday Prime Minister Shamir told the newspaper JERUSALEM POST that he has no intention of negotiating with the Palestinians as long as they refuse to accept his limited autonomy plan, that is decline to accept the Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands. Yuriy Solton comments:

Many people in the world, some Israel's friends among them, realize that a dangerous turn has taken place in the development of events. London and Washington called for not refusing to enter into talks with the Palestinians. I don't remember a sharper criticism of Tel Aviv on the part of the United States. According to reports from Washington, Secretary of State James Baker, who had vigorously sought to talk the Israelis into starting negotiations with the Palestinians, stunned the pro-Israeli House Committee on Foreign Affairs on Wednesday by his statement. When I addressed the committee in February, James Baker said, we were very close to the start of a historic and unprecedented dialogue between the Israelis and Palestinians. Had that dialogue begun we would have witnessed a different situation in the Middle East now, he said. If there is no dialogue there will be no peace, James Baker declared. He laid responsibility for disrupting the peace plan on Israel.

In my view, continues Yuriy Solton, that was a serious though belated demarche. Besides, it lacked self-criticism. Wasn't it America's policy of appeasing Israel that has led to this situation? Let's recall that only two weeks ago the United States envoy to the United Nations Security Council vetoed a resolution on forming a commission to clarify the situation in Palestinian lands drafted by the non-aligned countries. There are no reasons to be perplexed now. Israeli deems it possible to disregard the advice and admonitions of its protector and ignore the demands of the United Nations. Prime Minister Shamir, speaking at Wednesday's government session, confirmed that his decision to invite a personal envoy of the United Nations secretary general to visit the West Bank and Gaza Strip does not signify a change in his government's policy or intention to comply with the United Nations resolutions.

Time has come for the world community to act more resolutely. Let's remember that South Africa was forced to recognize Namibian independence after all, and why can't Israel be compelled to re-establish justice and return the lands it seized from the Palestinians?

Iran's Karrubi Reelected as Majles Speaker

NC1406140890 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners: IRNA reports that Majles Speaker Mehdi Karrubi has been reelected. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev comments on this:

It seems that Mehdi Karrubi's lucky star is in the best position in the sky of Iranian politics. It has been a relatively short time since this prototypical personality, who has risen from the grass roots of the revolution, emerged among the higher echelons of the Iranian statesmen. A few years ago he was not a renowned national figure and was in the second ranks of the Iranian leadership. Mehdi Karrubi was overshadowed for a long time, even though he was deputy to then-Majles Speaker 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani.

Mehdi Karrubi started to rise in the field of politics in August 1989 when he was elected as the Iranian Parliament's speaker. Some time later he was included in

Iran's Supreme Council for National Security which comprises all outstanding political leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Initially, some political observers believed that Mehdi Karrubi was a mediocre personality and that he would not maintain his position for very long. But time has shown that his position in the parliament is relatively strong. In the recent elections, he won with great confidence; so much so that according to Tehran Radio, 155 Majles deputies cast their votes for Mehdi Karrubi. His rival, former Interior Minister 'Ali Akbar Nateq-Nuri received only 73 votes. The truth is that reports indicate that only 229 of the 270 Majles deputies cast their votes. But apparently this does not change the general situation.

Most political observers link Mehdi Karrubi's name to the policies of Iranian conservatives and believe that among the higher echelon of Iranian statesmen, he is the spokesman for the radical clergymen who support the country's return to the Islamic intransigence of the first years of the revolution.

It is no secret that the current Majles speaker is also the leader of the Combatant Clergymen's Organization which is famous in Tehran for its conservative extremist views. This organization is striving to do its best to maintain the existing Islamic structure. The representatives of this organization often speak of the distance from Imam Khomeyni's ideas and accuse their opponents of propagating American-style Islam. Some time ago, in answer to a statement by reformists, Mehdi Karrubi threatened to take to the streets in order to explain the imam's ideas to the people.

In short, the (?political) stand of the Majles speaker is relatively clear. But I think that despite this, this person is not so one-dimensional. It seems that Mehdi Karrubi plays the role of a specific mediator between the cabinet of technocrats headed by President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani and the conservative majority in the Majles. On the basis of facts, this situation is favored by both sides. At least the Majles elections showed that all factions of the ruling class are trying to maintain the status quo.

Libya's Al-Qadhdhafi Holds Talks With Katushev

LD1406143190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1350 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Tripoli, 14 Jun—TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Anchikov reports:

Today, Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, received the heads of the Soviet and Libyan delegations at the bilateral talks taking place here—K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, and Fawzi al-Shakshuki, secretary of the General People's Committee for Petroleum of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah.

An exchange of information and opinions took place on a broad range of questions of Soviet-Libyan relations. Evaluating the course of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the results of the visit to the United States by M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR, M. al-Qadhdhafi expressed the interest of the Libyan Jamahiriyah in the development of Libyan-Soviet cooperation along all lines, having stressed the development of economic links.

Arab-Soviet Chamber of Commerce Ends Session

LD1406134790 Moscow TASS in English 1131 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kumachev]

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—The need to give greater scope to traditional trade and to develop new forms of economic cooperation was emphasised by participants in the seventh session of the Arab-Soviet Chamber of Commerce (ASCC), which ended here on Wednesday.

Representatives of Soviet organisations pointed out that trade and economoic relations figured prominently in the spectrum of the Soviet Union's cooperation with Arab countries.

Last year they accounted for 20 percent of the Soviet Union's foreign trade with and technical assistance to the developing countries. The USSR's commercial operations with Middle Eastern countries grew by 17 percent last year as compared with 1988, to top six billion roubles.

The aggregate value of agreements on Soviet organisations' technical assistance to this group of countries amounted to more than 10 billion roubles, with 270 economic facilities being brought into operation in Arab countries with Soviet assistance. Approximately another 80 are under construction.

Speaker at the session pointed to a number of difficulties that hinder the development of mutually beneficial business contacts: Arab countries' financial debt to the Soviet Union, the insufficient information about the situation and requirements of the sides' domestic markets, delays in the delivery of goods, and Soviet organisations' orientation towards cooperation with the state sector.

A number of specific proposals were made at the session to broaden and deepen trade and economic contacts, including building enterprises in Arab countries to assemble Soviet motor vehicles, boosting the establishment of joint ventures and co-production arrangements, and developing tourism. Arab firms could also participate in the restoration of the monuments of Islamic heritage in Soviet Central Asian republics and the issue of information and consultancy editions.

The sides' efforts to develop mutually beneficial contacts will lend still greater dynamism and scope to Soviet-Arab cooperation, speakers at the session pointed out.

East Europe

CPCZ Leader on 'Unexpected' Communist Victory

PM1206104790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Single Edition p 8

[Interview with Vasil Mohorita, first secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee, by TASS Prague correspondent A. Shapovalov: "Counter to Forecasts; first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] The stormy parliamentary election campaign has ended in Czechoslovakia. The results of the vote were announced yesterday. Representatives of 22 political parties and movements took part in the elections. The victory of the "Civic Forum" and "Public Against Violence" was convincing—its candidates received about 46 percent of the votes. In the opinion of local observers, the success of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] may be called unexpected. Counter to the forecasts it drove the Christian-Democratic Union into third place, receiving the support of approximately 14 percent of voters.

At the request of the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA editorial office A. Shapovalov, TASS correspondent in Prague, met with Vasil Mohorita, first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

[Shapovalov] Where specifically do you see the reasons for the large-scale anticommunist campaign? Sometimes it seems hard to explain, because many people have formed an image of Czechoslovakia as a country of firm and long-standing democratic traditions.

[Mohorita] This campaign was of course linked primarily with the past. But I believe that much is also directed toward the future. He who can observe objectively and without bias the CPCZ's development since December last year must see that the Communist Party is indeed changing. We have distanced ourselves from the past and from the principles which impeded the democratization of the CPCZ and its transformation into a modern left wing party. The reasons for the attacks on the Communist Party today are most likely the fears of our opponents that the CPCZ might again become an influential political force. As such it can to a considerable extent oppose the aspirations of some political circles to assert a new monopoly of power making it possible to implement changes in all spheres of public life which would guarantee a shift to the right for a long time—toward positions of conservatism both in the economy and in the field of social life and culture.

[Shapovalov] First of all I want to stress that the CPCZ has retained a considerable membership base. It has over 0.5 million members. Having experienced a profound crisis they have been able to organize themselves again, to formulate a program at the level of the demands of the times, and to actively join in their country's political life. It should be noted that this has happened thanks to the tremendous efforts not only of the leadership and the new territorial organs of the party but primarily thanks to the majority of CPCZ members who remained in the party ranks after 17 November last year. But that is not the only thing. The economic and social conditions in which Czechoslovakia is proceeding along the new path are more favorable than in some countries in East Europe despite the fact that many of our opponents do not want to recognize that.

As I have already said and as is stressed in the program and organizational documents, we are not now seeking to gain a leading role in society. We want to be an equal partner within the framework of a pluralist democracy, to implement our intentions and aims in equal rivalry with other political forces. The internal party building should also accord with this.

The party must be open to all those who seek social justice and democracy, despite the fact that they may have different views on their implementation. Only in this way can our party successfully be a partner of the other progressive parties and movements. Only thus can people's trust be restored.

CPCZ Wins Despite Forecast

LD1306124690 Moscow International Service in Czech 1700 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Commentary by station analyst Valentin Aleksandrov]

[Text] As is usually the case, the forecasts were right in some aspects, but wrong in others. Civic Forum (CF) and Public Against Violence (PAV) came out on top, as expected, but the forecasts about Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPCZ) were not fulfilled. Some people, as we know, considered the CPCZ a spent force, expecting it to crumble and totally disappear from the Czechoslovak political arena under the hailstorm of various allegations, fabrications, and demands for it to be banned, primarily from rightwing parties and groups. So how did the forecast match up to reality? The CPCZ ran in second in the elections, behind CF and its Slovak counterpart PAV, and all this without any kind of advertising campaign—so what is the reason?

In my view there are several reasons. In a relatively short period the CPCZ implemented a process of self-purificaiton, expelling members of the former leadership who employed administrative-command methods of work and who did not, to put it mildly, stand out in terms of personal ethics. The party rid itself of its ballast, that is to say those who joined for careerist reasons. In short, the CPCZ is no longer the same party it was last autumn, and its transformation into a modern leftwing party championing the social interests of the working people is still underway. The voters could not fail to recognize this fact.

Furthermore, the rabid attacks on the CPCZ by rightwing forces and certain sections of CF and PAV had, in

many cases, a boomerang effect. After being told that democracy, humanity, and justice had triumphed, the people were unwilling to accept the mass slander of communists, many of whom they knew well as colleagues at work or as friends—nor did they forget the useful work done by the communists in the social sphere. Naturally, the persecution of communists rankled, all the more so because it came from the right wing, and also from people striving for their own monopoly on power.

A significant role was also played, in my view, by the popular president's statement that the communist ranks also included thousands and thousands of decent people working conscientiously for their ideals and their homeland. There are now more than half a million of these in Czechoslovakia, and that is not including those supporters who voted for CPCZ candidates.

All this means that the CPCZ, despite losing the power it previously held, has remained an influential political force, and if it can implement its policy of pluralist democracy in a consistent way, we have reason to be optimistic about its future. So far the results are promising—14 percent of the vote, which means that about two and a half million voted for the CPCZ.

Right-Wing Forces Defeated

PM1206120590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch: "CSFR: Defeat for Right-Wingers"]

[Text] Prague—I would consider the defeat of right-wing forces the chief result of the free parliamentary elections in Czechoslovakia. "Civic Forum" and its Slovak counterpart—"Public Against Violence"—which led from the first days of the election campaign and gained approximately half of the votes, were the indisputable winners of the elections to both chambers of parliament. The surprise was the second place held by the CPCZ (13.5 percent of the votes). There proved to be more supporters of the CPCZ than members, and it was not just the party voting for itself.

CPCZ Chairman L. Adamec pointed out that, despite the pressure and threats, it proved possible to preserve the party and prevent its disintegration. The party will have a worthy representation in the country's parliament. All this has proved the correctness of the CPCZ's election tactics founded on the principles of decency, a nonconfrontational approach, and dissociation from the negative phenomena of the past.

The Christian Democratic Union gained fewer votes than expected and ended up in third place. The scandal that broke out during the very last days over the personality of J. Bartoncik, deputy chairman of the Federal Assembly and representative of the Czechoslovak People's Party, which is a member of the union—as reported already in IZVESTIYA—probably had a substantial effect on the Christian Democratic Union's result. This affair is not yet over. But the compromising blow (Bartoncik is charged with 17 years of service as a paid secret agent of the state security organs) evidently proved too powerful. Neither protests nor even the fact that the chairman of the Central Electoral Commission spoke in this connection about a blatant violation of the election laws helped...

There are other surprises too—for example, the successful showing in the elections of the Slovak National Party and the Movement for Self-Managing Democracy—Moravia and Slovakia Society. Their success undoubtedly reflects the significance of the national question in the country.

The recently still authoritative Czechoslovak Socialist Party ended up somewhere in the rear, the social democrats and the "greens" also failed to surmount the five-percent barrier and get into parliament, and the coalition of agrarian parties also failed to achieve success.

Let us return to the thesis of the right-wingers' defeat as the chief result of the elections. Those that lost include, above all, several parties whose names feature the words "free" and "republican." These are parties that tend to be extremely "demanding" in their programs: Eliminate the Warsaw Pact at once and send all the "occupiers" packing from Czechoslovak soil right away. Outlaw the CPCZ and grant economic advantages only only private businessmen.... With their insistent extremism, they all ended up far in the background. It should be pointed out that the Christian Democratic Union, which did not put up a very successful showing, also openly counts itself among the right-wingers. At any rate, one of its serious leaders—J. Carnogursky, deputy premier of the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federal Republic]—has spoken of such an orientation.

People might ask: Where does "Civic Forum" itself stand? A difficult question. It has not only adherents of the former regime and the old thinking who are inclined to regard "Civic Forum" as a movement of right-wingers. However, a serious analysis of all the major actions by this powerful public organization, the clarity of its program, and its political flexibility and dynamism suggest a different characterization.

President V. Havel reported Sunday evening that 96 percent of the electorate participated in the elections. Another surprise! They can be proud of such great activeness. Foreign observers, including Council of Europe representatives, made a high assessment of the elections.

During the coming week it will become known whom the CSFR president will entrust with forming the federal government.

Zagladin Attends Prague East Europe Symposium

LD1406100390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Boris Bazhanov]

[Excerpts] Prague, 13 Jun (TASS)—An international symposium "Changes in Europe - the Humanitarian Perspective" closed here today. It was organized by the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent societies in collaboration with the Czechoslovak Red Cross Organization. [passage omitted] V.V. Zagladin, adviser to the USSR president, spoke at the symposium, analyzing the processes now taking place in the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe. [passage omitted]

Yakovlev, GDR's Gysi Discuss Unification

LD1406210390 Moscow TASS in English 1833 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, today met on Mikhail Gorbachev's instructions with Gregor Gysi, chairman of the Party of Democratic Socialism (German Democratic Republic).

The Soviet side expressed the CPSU's solidarity with the Party of Democratic Socialism. Discrimination attempts against the party were qualified as the violation of generally recognised democratic principles.

On the German unification issue, Gysi supported the USSR's stance at the two-plus-four negotiations.

Both sides agreed that the process should continue on the basis of reciprocal respect for the equality and sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, within the context of all-European development, with due account for the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union and other countries—in brief, this should be genuine unification.

Peoples in Europe and the world at large have the right to obtain firm guarantees that a future Germany will never become a source of threat but, on the contrary, will turn into a factor contributing to European stability and security.

Both sides stressed readiness to deepen ties between the CPSU and the Party of Democratic Socialism.

Yazov on Need for All-European Security

LD1406164190 Hamburg DPA in German 1539 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Excerpts] East Berlin (DPA)—In the view of Soviet Defense Minister Dmitri Yazov, a united Germany must be integrated in an all-European security structure. It cannot just be part of an alliance, Yazov said on the sidelines of a meeting of the defense ministers of the Warsaw Pact in Strausberg near East Berlin today. The Soviet people cannot be told that the Soviet Union will withdraw from Europe while the United States remains.

He said that the Germans have the right to unification. The peoples of the Soviet Union have understanding for the wish of the Germans. At the same time a number of questions must be settled. The main issue is to draw a line under the war once and for all. Juristically, Germany is still in a state of war.

Asked what a European security structure will look like, Yazov stated that politicians and diplomats will have to work on this and "anything is possible if goodwill is present." The restructuring of the Warsaw Pact Armed Forces will be "examined and negotiated multilaterally" in the context of German unification and the restructuring of the defense structures. [passage omitted]

Asked whether there will still be a Warsaw Pact in the forseeable future, Yazov said: "Let us hope so."

Split in Solidarity Forces 'Serious' for Poland

PM1206125790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov dispatch: "Lovers' Tiff?... The Situation in Poland's Solidarity"]

[Text] Warsaw—"The war of everyone with everyone else," declared quite recently by L. Walesa, is certainly no literary metaphor, however much he has tried to explain himself in this connection since. A keen struggle is being waged among the forces working under the "Solidarity" standard. Is the prediction made by J. Urban while he was still press spokesman for the former government—namely, that if Solidarity were to get into power its members would come to blows—now coming true? Power is the touchstone by which people are tested.

Addressing a session of the Citizens' Parliamentary Club recently, its chairman, Prof. B. Geremek, remarked: "Our enemies are glad that we are beginning to show signs of a split. When our camp breathes words of poison and hatred, it wounds me deeply. The arrogance of those who are greedy for power 'and who feel that they have not found a place in the sun' is making itself strongly felt...." The professor added that poisonous words are flowing from the pages of publications using the Solidarity symbols but that there are also publications which, although bearing the same symbols, nevertheless allow themselves to be objective and critical regarding Solidarity and its policies. These include GAZETA WYBORCZA, for example, headed by A. Michnik. War has been declared on it.

Correspondence between L. Walesa and A. Michnik and between L. Walesa and H. Wujec, secretary of the Citizens' Committee under the Solidarity chairman, has been published. This correspondence convincingly shows that political life in Poland is run by the government, the Citizens' Parliamentary Club, and the Citizens' Committee, which work independently and on

their own initiative. L. Walesa and the Solidarity National Commission appear to be on the sidelines, with little role to play in decision making and with insignificant influence. All the best Solidarity forces who used to be Walesa's closest associates have left to join the government and parliament, thereby stripping the trade union movement of its intellectual might. Essentially, Walesa has been left with people like the energetic, forceful Kaczynski brothers (one is his deputy and the other is chief editor of the weekly TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC).

Wishing to look like a man with the right to make decisions, cadre decisions included, and evidently not without prompting from his advisers, Walesa has decided that he wants to remove H. Wujec from office as secretary of the Citizens' Committee and A. Michnik from his position as chief editor of GAZETA WYBORCZA. Again there is confusion. Wujec has said that he was appointed by the committee and not by Walesa and that only the committee can dismiss him. A. Michnik gave his reply to Walesa in GAZETA WYBORCZA:

"Lech, as it seems to me, has reached the conclusion that he must personally and as arbiter decide questions concerning appointments to various posts. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to give up my position as chief editor to the next Kaczynski brother if the editorial collegium should make that decision. What is involved in this conflict? The new-look Polish political scene, the attitude to Tadeusz Mazowiecki's government, and persistent efforts at destabilization by those supporters of Walesa who want to see him elected president this fall by the present parliament. We have not supported this idea in our newspaper."

It is GAZETA WYBORCZA rather than some left-wing newspaper that has said that it would not want to see Walesa become "monarch of a post-communist kingdom."

L. Walesa has decided to deprive GAZETA WYBORCZA of the right to use the Solidarity logo, although it seems that A. Michnik has not submitted to this.

Usually every issue of the newspaper publishes telephone responses from its readers on an event of the day. But one issue carried the following announcement instead of the readers' responses: "We ask our readers to forgive us, but we will not be publishing their responses today. Everyone who telephoned us yesterday only wanted to condemn Lech Walesa's actions against Henryk Wujec and Adam Michnik."

Is this just a harmless lovers' tiff? No, the situation is far more serious.

Poland's Walesa, Michnik Split Assessed

PM1306160990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 p 1

[Report by "our correspondent" V. Shutkevich: "Lech Walesa: 'Adam Is a Friend to Me But...'"]

[Text] "Adam and I are friends and it will not be hard for us to resolve together the problems which have arisen around your newspaper. I see the need: 1) to relieve you of your post as chief editor... and 2) to remove from GAZETA WYBORCZA the right to use the 'Solidarity' graphic sign.

"I am obliged to take these decisions but I should like to do it in a comradely manner....

"L. W., Gdansk, 1 June."

"Lech, I have always spoken with you sincerely. That is how it will be this time too. Life has advanced even further than emerges from your letter. As chairman of 'Solidarity,' a mass movement of Polish democracy, you are increasingly turning into a Caesar who issues instructions to his latest colleagues: 'I inform you that you are dismissed....'

"Adam Michnik, Warsaw, 4 June."

Everyone knows from childhood that it is wrong to read other people's letters. But this private correspondence, which was recently published in full by GAZETA WYBORCZA, has been tensely followed by millions of Poles. Moreover, the world's biggest news agencies have informed their readers of its content as a political sensation which could have important significance.

What explains this attention? Of course, primarily the place which the participants in the correspondence occupy on the Polish political scene. Let us briefly recall that Lech Walesa is a 47-year-old electrician from Gdansk. From the moment of "Solidarity's" emergence in 1980 and throughout subsequent years he has been its constant leader. He was interned from 13 December 1981 through November 1982. In 1983 he won the Nobel Peace Prize. At the elections in June last year "Solidarity," which he leads, won the majority of seats in parliament and for the first time formed its own government. In April 1990 at the second "Solidarity" congress he was again elected chairman of its leading organ—the national executive commission. Without holding any formal state posts, L. Walesa nonetheless enjoys the prestige of a national leader.

Adam Michnik, 46 years old, is a historian by education and a journalist by profession. In 1968 he was expelled from Warsaw University and sentenced to three years' imprisonment for taking part in Polish student protests against the policy of Gomulka's government. In 1977 he became one of the organizers and active members of the so-called "workers' defense committee." In 1980-1981 he was an adviser for "Solidarity" at the Lenin metallurgical combine in Nowa Huta. On 13 December 1981

he was also interned. He was freed under the 1984 amnesty and then sentenced to three years' imprisonment. Last year he became chief editor of the first legal organ of the resurrected "Solidarity"—GAZETA WYBORCZA—and was elected a parliament deputy. Throughout these years he has been regarded as one of the most influential people in the entourage of L. Walesa, who has frequently stressed his closeness to his future adversary, recalling that he is the godfather of A. Michnik's son and therefore "a member of his family."

The discord which ensued in the "noble family" was all the more unexpected and incomprehensible to many Poles. What is the essence of the conflict? As readers themselves may have concluded from the correspondence it lies in Lech Walesa's decision to remove A. Michnik from the post of chief editor of GAZETA WYBORCZA. It is true that two days later that Walesa explained that he merely intends to "put in order" the trade union's relations with the newspaper. He explains his decision by strictly formal reasons: He says that he appointed Michnik editor before a private joint-stock company became the owner of GAZETA WYBORCZA. And now "Solidarity" cannot support it.

But this explanation did not suit the chief editor of GAZETA WYBORCZA and those who think like him. They publicly accused Walesa of authoritarianism and the desire for unlimited "imperial" power and the desire to suppress any critical statements leveled against him. They recalled the recent story involving the similar "dismissal" of "Solidarity" Citizens Committee Secretary H. Wujec. Wujec was elected collegially but it was once again Walesa who individually dismissed him from his post, and in a quite ostentatious and rude form. According to Adam Michnik behind the present "conflict by mail" there stands "the persistent desire of Walesa's supporters to destabilize the situation in the country and elect him president as early as this fall." GAZETA WYBORCZA sinned in that it not only did not support that idea but also allowed itself sometimes to criticize the actions of the "Solidarity" chairman...

Are the rebukes against Walesa justified? In part I think they are. The position of the informal leader, the "uncrowned king" of the country, which he now holds seems to no longer suit him. Having achieved considerable power over the minds and actions of his compatriots, Walesa wants also to acquire real power.

But it is not only a matter of the "Solidarity" chairman's personal ambitions. Even his main opponents acknowledge that, alongside these ambitions, Walesa also has striking political intuition or, as he himself says, "a good sense of smell." This time intuition is suggesting to Walesa that public dissatisfaction with the negative consequences of the economic reform which T. Mazowiecki's government is pursuing is reaching the critical mark.

Unless the material position of the majority of ordinary Poles improves in the very near future, and it is hard to expect that, then there may be a social eruption. And in order not to fall under the wave of dissatisfaction himself, Walesa is hurrying just in case to move as far to the side as possible and to dissociate himself from his former fellow fighters, announcing—so far, it is true, only verbally—a "war on the government" and those who support this government. At the same time the "Solidarity" chairman, as he acknowledges himself, is seeking "to prepare other groups which could assume responsibility for the situation in the country."

At the same time a number of leading politicians close to GAZETA WYBORCZA intend to leave the "Citizens' Committee" under the "Solidarity" chairman and create a broad civic coalition supporting the present government's reforms. The group's name—the "Union for Democracy"—was approved at the meeting of supporters of the coalition in Krakow last Sunday. I think that in the near future the organizational split of "Solidarity," the first sign of which was the "divorce by mail" between Walesa and Michnik, will be manifested most clearly.

Polish Youth Group Poses Threat to Leadership

PM1206101390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 90 p 3

[Correspondent V. Shutkevich dispatch: "Bitter Honey from 'Golden Hive': Our Correspondent in Poland Talks With a Leader of an Anti-Soviet Youth Grouping"]

[Text] Gdansk-Warsaw—In Gdansk during the last days of May members of extremist youth groupings mounted a pogrom outside the Soviet Consulate building, throwing homemade bombs at its walls and breaking windows. On 3 May the best-known of these groupings—the FMW [Fighting Youth Federation]—organized a demonstration outside the walls of St. Brygida's Church, demanding the resignation of Solidarity Chairman L. Walesa and of T. Mazowiecki, the country's prime minister. A brawl ensued between the demonstrators and parishioners. Finally, on 7 June three homemade bombs exploded in the streets of Gdansk, and responsibility for them was claimed by the so-called "Free Opposition Group '13 December.'" In this way young anarchists decided to protest against the unobjective—from their viewpoint—coverage of the events outside the Soviet Consulate in the local press. It was sheer luck that there were no casualties....

What do all these events mean? How strong are anti-Soviet sentiments among young people? What arouses their displeasure in the actions of L. Walesa and the present Polish Government? Mariusz Roman answers these and other questions.

...I was on my way to a dangerous meeting, whose time and place had been imparted to me by telephone. Our compatriots living in Gdansk had warned me that it might cost me dear. "We have seen enough of them, for God's sake... When they were burning Russian books in the square, when they were bawling 'Soviets, go home!'

and when they were throwing stones at our consulate. Mind you don't get it too. They are quite uncontrollable people—Walesa himself cannot lay down the law for them..."

However, the more they tried to dissuade me, the more my interest in the "uncontrollable" elements grew. It proved far from simple to contact them. The telephone number of the FMW—probably the best-known extremist youth grouping in Poland—did not feature in any dir[illegible]t was only thanks to my colleagues, the ubiquito[illegible]sk newspapermen, that I succeeded in contacti[illegible]z Roman, one of its leaders. Contrary to expecta[illegible]ne at once responded to a proposal to talk. We agreed to meet in Sopot, at the "Golden Hive" bar, where the federation's activists and teenaged sympathizers usually gather.

[Shutkevich] Mariusz, you are a leader of the radically inclined public group called "angry youth" in Poland. Prior to last year's parliamentary elections the federation's slogan was "Down with the commune!" and "No freedom without Solidarity!" Whom and what are you angry with, now that the Solidarity government is in power?

[Roman] But it is a different Solidarity—not at all the one whose legalization we sought! After last spring's "roundtable" virtually a new trade union with new statutes was registered. The statutes do not include, for example, such a very important point as the right to strike. By putting out of action the members of Solidarity's All-Polish Executive Commission elected at its first congress in 1980, Walesa essentially staged a coup against the old Solidarity. Former communist dissidents who, in our view, cannot guarantee Poland's independence and sovereignty acceded to power in the country with his blessing. This is why we do not recognize the Mazowiecki government.

The majority of the federation's members consider the Polish emigre government in London headed by President R. Kaczorowski the symbol of sovereign power. It is the same government that led the people during the war years. It must return to the country and transfer its powers to a new government and parliament, to be be elected in the course of truly free elections. And these elections, in turn, can be held only after Soviet troops have been withdrawn from our territory altogether and Poland has really become independent.

[Shutkevich] To be honest, I have formed the impression that the majority of your fellow countrymen regard the government in London as a historical relic. It is all the more strange that it is none other than young people who are campaigning for its return....

[Roman] Then I will have to talk about everything in order. Our federation came into being in 1984. Right from the start it was a youth movement whose members considered it their chief task to continue the cause of J. Pilsudski and to revive a strong, sovereign, independent Poland. For us this revival was inseparably linked with the legalization of Solidarity, which at that time was underground. During the strikes of May and August 1988 many members of our federation prepared and disseminated Solidarity's printed publications, painted slogans on house walls in support of it, brought food to the strikers, fulfilled the role of messengers, etc. Lech Walesa needed us at that time.

Later, when the "roundtable" talks were held, we came out resolutely against a compact with the communists. Then Walesa began threatening us with the strap, with the organs of law and order, and even with the gallows, on which, he said, the people would hang us.... We had to choose: Go on supporting Walesa or stay loyal to our main, original idea. We chose the latter. I must admit that at first this led to a split in the federation's ranks, which was overcome only a few months ago.

The FMW today is the only all-Polish political youth organization. We also have supporters abroad—for example, in Greece, Canada, and even the Soviet Union, among Poles living in Grodno, Vilnius, and Lvov. I find it hard to say how many members we have in all, because until very recently we were operating illegally and did not keep such statistics. I can only tell you that 2,500 membership cards were printed a few months ago and are now being distributed throughout the country. The federation already has draft statutes, and the program is now being worked on. As previously, our chief aim is the struggle for Poland's independence and sovereignty.

[Shutkevich] Fine slogans, and yet everyone advocates them today. How, specifically, do you see a "strong, sovereign, independent Poland"?

[Roman] First of all, the treaties between Poland and the Soviet Union, which put our country in the position of a vassal, must be torn up. The FMW believes that Poland continues to be the de jure master of all the eastern lands assigned to it under the Treaty of Riga (these lands now form part of the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Lithuania—V.Sh.). It is very important to us that the USSR Supreme Soviet has recognized the invalidity of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, which legitimated, as it were, the annexation of those lands. We believe that the question of the eastern border between our states is not finally settled. However, in our view, it must be resolved not by the governments of Poland and the Soviet Union but by the free parliaments of Poland and of Belorussia, the Ukraine, and the Baltic states bordering on it. We support the desire of those republics' citizens for full independence and autonomy.

[Shutkevich] How do you see relations with your closest neighbors?

[Roman] We support the idea of creating a confederation of Poland, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and the Baltic republics and also, maybe, of Slovakia and Romania—an idea advanced in the past by Pilsudski. In our view this must be a kind of state "from sea to sea." Only in this way will

the countries of East Europe be able to create a strong political structure, with which both Moscow and Berlin will have to reckon.

[Shutkevich] Since you have mentioned Berlin.... Does it not seem to you that your fellow countrymen today are far more concerned about the future of the western border? Incidentally, many of them consider the presence of Soviet troops on Poland's territory a guarantee of its security....

[Roman] We cannot take such arguments seriously. In the past relations between our peoples have shaped up in different ways, but still they have more often found themselves on different sides of the barricades.

We do not believe Pan Gorbachev, we do not believe that he will defend Poland's interests with the help of Soviet troops—he will champion his own interests. Nor do we trust the present Polish authorities, which are continuing to disarm the Polish Army in the face of the unification of Germany and the strengthening of the Bundeswehr. In such a situation we have to gamble on creating our own military force, which will counter the growing German threat. Incidentally, the federation intends in the very near future to tackle the organization of sports camps for young people, to train kids in self-defense methods, etc. We believe that in the struggle for independence we have the right to use all means, including weapons.... [Roman ends]

Here I consider it possible to interrupt the interview. I heard nothing more of interest from my interlocutor. But what I have already cited provokes serious thought.

I will point out first of all that in all the time I have worked in Poland this is the first time I have encountered such a clearly proclaimed dislike of our country. Moreover, it has to be thought that my interlocutor tailored his expressions for a conversation with a Soviet journalist. Among themselves his colleagues employ far more severe terms. The FMW's printed publications really compete in the sphere of insulting "communist agents" in the country and the "Soviet empire." In this the publishers do not disdain even blatant lies.

The FMW information bulletin published in Lodz carries, for example, a "secret instruction for the Soviet Embassy in Warsaw" dated 2 February 1947, which supposedly defined the nature of the Soviet special services' activities beyond the Bug for the subsequent decades. If the compilers of this forgery are to believed, their task was as follows: "To work to ensure that working people employed in the state sector, with the exception of punitive organs and workers in the mining industry, receive low earnings"; "to create obstacles in the working of transport" and even "to try to ensure that in the rehabilitation and development of industry effluent is discharged directly into rivers which act as drinking water reservoirs."

It would be possible to laugh at the compilers' unbridled imagination and their infinite faith in the potential of our special services. However, when you read in the draft FMW statutes that one of its chief tasks is to "prepare young people for violence against Soviet agents," you no longer feel like laughing. God only knows whom the FMW militants number among these agents. Soviet Embassy staffers? Representatives of our trade firms? The technical specialists working here on contracts, or us journalists? At present, it has to be thought, "violence" is being prepared only on Polish territory. However, it is not hard to guess how greatly its scale would increase after a "settlement of the eastern borders question...."

I must confess that previously I too had not heard in Poland such overtly expressed claims to the "eastern lands," which for more than half a century have been part of our country's territory. For a long time we assiduously pretended that the "eastern borders question" never existed. But does this mean that it did not exist for our neighbors across the Bug either? Of course not. It would be naive to think that the millions of Poles resettled after the war from the former "eastern territories" to the western lands along the Neisse and the Oder newly acquired by Poland have forgotten where they were born and where the graves of their grandparents and great-grandparents remain. It is possible to understand in a human way their nostalgia for their lost family home and their desire to return to their birthplaces.

But, at the same time, the majority of the people originating from the prewar "eastern marches" of the Rzeczpospolita with whom I have discussed this topic are well aware that sentiments must not prevail over a sense of reality and cannot govern politics.

Members of the FMW, it has to be thought, also realize this. But how do they picture in practice the "settlement" of the eastern territories question? Pilsudski's scheme for some "confederation of neighboring peoples," in which the chief role is, of course, allocated to Poland, is again dragged out into the light. But these peoples themselves—Ukrainians, Belorussians, Lithuanians—well remember how the idea of a "confederation" actually turned out in prewar Poland, what a very cruel national yoke they had to experience....

I have heard many Poles say that the FMW is an incidental phenomenon in the country's public life. This may even be so. However, the growth of chauvinist and nationalist sentiments in Poland is a perfectly real danger, not one invented by me.

Kvitsinskiy, Polish Envoy Discuss Ties

LD1206193690 Warsaw PAP in English 1736 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 12—Poland's ambassador to the Soviet Union Stanislaw Ciosek was received by Soviet Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Yuliy Kvitsinskiy here today.

The talk dealt with the meeting of the foreign affairs minister of the Soviet Union and the FRG held in Brest,

foreign aspects of solving the German question of the four-plus-two negotiations, as well as with some of the issues of Polish-Soviet cooperation.

Correspondent Details Bucharest Riots, Crackdown

PM1406120990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent V. Vedrashko under the "Theme of the Day" rubric: "Starting From Scratch?"]

[Text] Bucharest, 13 Jun—It is 1200 hours local time. I am standing in University Square, which is cordoned off by a tight ring of police buses. None of the participants in the marathon demonstration which had lasted since April is here any more.

Early this morning an operation was conducted to clear the vast space in the center of the Romanian capital. Two hundred and sixty-three people were arrested. The barricades, tents, and soap boxes were removed. The lawn in front of the National Theater is being thoroughly plowed up and the soil disinfected and washed. The many posters, placards, and inscriptions on the walls of the buildings there are being removed.

It was on the square that I met General Dumitru Bitlan, chief of the Bucharest city police general inspectorate, who was wearing ordinary civilian clothes and looking tired after a sleepless night.

To my question of whether anyone had been injured during the operation, Mr Bitlan said no and explained that "force had to be used against certain demonstrators, of course."

[Vedrashko] "Will life on the square return to normal soon?"

[Bitlan] "We intend to restore this important link to the city's transport system by tomorrow morning. But that isn't the problem: It is whether those people who deliberately mounted a lengthy occupation of the square will have the common sense not to create emergency situations here again."

Hundreds of Bucharest people have now gathered on the approaches to the square. In the gaps between the police buses they are trying to catch a glimpse of the unusually deserted square and are engaging in a lively exchange of opinions. Many people think that it was time order was restored and they approve the authorities' action.

Others fear that the square, blockaded for almost 2 months by the demonstrators, could now remain blockaded by the police.

It is 1400 hours local time. I have just witnessed the biggest clash between the civilian population and the forces of law and order since the beginning of the year. Events developed in that direction after midday from the time that the first rocks and home-made bombs were hurled at the police subunits on Architecture Street near University Square.

Yesterday's occupants of University Square had summoned up their strength and were trying to regain the ground by the walls of the Intercontinental Hotel—a symbol of the "neocommunism-free zone." They were opposed by large police subunits—both army and Interior Ministry men. Bloody clashes began—I saw at least 10 policemen wounded. The rocks thrown at them also hit cars parked on the roadside.

Eventually the police appeared, equipped with riot shields. They mounted a number of determined attacks against the demonstrators but were forced to retreat under a hail of rocks and bottles. General Diamandescu, deputy interior minister, gave the order: "Retreat no further than the line of buses." I asked a colonel: "Why weren't you given riot shields from the very beginning? After all, many of your people have already been injured." He shrugged and took a long drag on his cigarette. "Instead we will memorize them all and photograph them," he said as we parted, with a glance at my camera. I said that I hoped he would be safe. A few minutes later (my watch showed 4:15) the soldiers and policemen retreated at the double from a burning bus which was in danger of exploding. Demonstrators crying "Victory!" burst into University Square. Soon police buses and cars were on fire all around the perimeter of the square, tires were starting to burst and gas tanks to explode. The square filled with black smoke which rose high above the city center.

The forces of law and order withdrew on the double along the rock-strewn highway—30 minutes earlier the police had been hurling them at their attackers. Upon observing this scene a middle-aged man standing alongside me shouted to the officers: "What are you doing! How can you, armed with riot shields, throw rocks at these youngsters? They were shot at here in December! Even at the front I never saw so disgraceful a scene as this!"

It is strange, but at that time I didn't hear a single person criticize the demonstrators. I think that they were all shocked by the clash, which was equally brutal on both sides.

It is 1630 hours Bucharest time. I am leaving the square to send this report to the newspaper. The words "Down with Iliescu!" chanted by many thousands of people echoed above the square. On my way to the correspondents' center I ran into a convoy of army trucks carrying soldiers. They were headed toward University Square.

Romanian Television has just broadcast a statement by the country's president. It says:

"This morning the forces of law and order acted legally to restore public order. They freed University Square and afterward everything was done to clear it of garbage.

These actions were carried out without particular incident, and only a few individuals were detained on a charge of violating elementary rules of public order.

"Beginning at 1400 hours, a group of people armed with knives and home-made bombs attacked the police forces. After beating up some policemen and setting fire to police buses they invaded University Square, inciting acts of violence and the violation of public order. We appeal to all inhabitants of the capital, in the name of the democracy won in free elections, to firmly reject all irresponsible acts of violence and to support the forces of law and order in restoring an atmosphere of calm and legality. We call on all conscious and responsible forces to meet in front of the government and TV center buildings to reject all attempts by extremist groups using strong-arm pressure and to protect the democracy that was so hard won."

As I dictate these lines now at about 1800 hours local time the situation has become even worse. The demonstrators have tried to storm the television station and burn down the Bucharest police headquarters.

West Europe

Bundeswehr Servicemen End Visit to USSR

LD0606141190 Moscow TASS in English 1357 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Chistyakov]

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—"These ten days have changed us immensely," 20-year-old Marko Vollmar, the youngest member of a group of West German servicemen who visited the Soviet Union, said before leaving the USSR today.

This is the first such visit by Bundeswehr servicemen to the USSR. It was organised by the NOVOSTI press agency and the DIE WELT newspaper in response to last year's trip by Soviet servicemen to the FRG.

During their 10-day stay in the Soviet Union, the West German guests visited Leningrad, Kiev and Moscow. They called at military units and talked to soldiers and officers. The delegation met top commanders of the Soviet Army, including First Deputy Defence Minister and Chief of the Soviet General Staff General Mikhail Moiseyev. In addition to military meetings, they met Chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet Ivan Laptev and deputies of the Moscow City Council.

The West German servicemen believe the trip was more than a mere exchange programme. They were impressed by the warm and informal atmosphere of the meetings they had and the free discussion of the most acute problems. The discussions focused, of course, on the reunification of the FRG and the GDR and prospects for Soviet-German relations. Although their views did not always coincide, particularly on reunified Germany's membership in NATO, they highly appreciated the dialogue.

The West German guests said they were taking home excellent impressions of the visit. Colonel Gerhard Bronisch will be able to show his colleagues a photograph of him on the turret of a Soviet tank in the Kantemirovskaya Guards Division near Moscow. They are also taking home many souvenirs—Soviet officers' caps and even winter hats that they bought up in an army shop.

Naval officer Tomas Scholz, a manager in civilian life, got a bright idea during the visit. He was so impressed by the long queue outside the McDonald's restaurant in Moscow, that he decided to explore the possibility of setting up a network of joint public catering enterprises in Moscow.

Bundestag Deputies End European Security Meeting

LD0906141390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1055 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 8 Jun (TASS)—A delegation from the working group on issues of the Christian Democratic Union-Christian Social Union faction in the FRG Bundestag visited Moscow 4-8 June at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. The delegation was headed by Bernd Wilz, chairman of the working group and Bundestag deputy. Nine deputies from this faction were members of the delegation.

The delegation had meetings and conversations with Vadim Zagladin, the chairman of the committee, with Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, adviser of the USSR president and with representatives of the defense, state security, and international affairs committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The guests were received in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in the USSR Ministry of Defense and they visited the Frunze military academy.

The West German parliamentarians laid wreathes at the tomb of the unknown soldier.

During the meetings and conversations, issues concerning the prospects for strengthening security in Europe, the future of the military-political alliances, arms reduction, and the unification of the two German states were discussed.

FRG Reaction to Washington Summit Viewed

PM0706091590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent Ye. Grigoryev: "Echo of Washington Meeting"]

[Text] Bonn, 6 Jun—FRG political circles and mass media have devoted special attention to the USSR

president's U.S. visit not only because of its significance for world politics, the continuation of the disarmament process, and the further improvement of the international climate. On the whole, people here share the conclusion that the Washington meeting confirms the switch from confrontation to an epoch of cooperation.

However, Bonn's extremely close look at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was determined primarily by the German question. In connection with the well-known changes since the Malta meeting it could not fail to feature on the Washington talks agenda. The West German side took an active part in preparing its U.S. ally for the upcoming talks. The obvious aim was to secure Soviet consent to NATO membership for the future united Germany. Chancellor H. Kohl and Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher crossed the ocean specially to "arm" the U.S. side with weighty arguments—as their authors see it—in favor of such a decision. Indeed, at least several of the nine points of the U.S. position on the German question resemble very closely Bonn's well known approaches. With regard, for example, to a "transitional agreement on the continued presence (maybe for many years) of Soviet troops on the territory of the present GDR," to "economic agreements between Germany and the USSR," and a number of others.

Taking their cue from someone (?prompted by someone), the mass media here deliberately declared German affairs—particularly the question of Germany's future military-political status—to have been almost the crux of the talks in Washington and at Camp David. And the results of the Soviet-U.S. meeting are now being assessed in accordance with this. And opinions are ambivalent.

Official opinions have included a statement by the chancellor. He confidently emphasized that "internal and external aspects of German unity can be resolved in good time." At the same time he seemed to allude to Bonn's immutable intention to hold pan-German elections no later than next January and thereby determine the time frame for the work of the "two plus four" group, which has been entrusted with coordinating external aspects of the building of German unity. Kohl added that the federal government "will endeavor to promote the success of the summit meeting by its own proposals and measures." It is not yet being explained when they will appear or of what they will consist.

Newspapers state: "As previously, Bush and Gorbachev failed to achieve unity with regard to the united Germany's NATO membership." Conservative commentators are annoyed at this. One even writes that Moscow is "trying to undermine NATO and to save the Soviet Union's imperial supremacy by slandering the Germans." But the majority of writers of editorials and commentaries in the West German press evidently realize that the times when the world was perceived only in black and white are gone. They point out that in Washington there were no arguments over ready-made concepts and that the atmosphere of the talks was determined by a joint search for answers to the new challenges of the time. No one tried to impose his own vision of the future on anyone else. Many people express such thoughts. As regards aspects of German unity associated with security, it has become clear, F. Kemna, chief editor of GENERAL-ANZEIGER, writes, that "they are to be settled not within the framework of antagonistic military blocs but only on the path of a broader European balance of interests."

Radio, TV Protocol With FRG Signed 14 Jun

LD1406140190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1212 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 14 Jun (TASS)—A protocol on cooperation between the USSR Gosteleradio and the West German radio and television agency (WDR) was signed here today.

The further development of the exchanges of television and radio materials about the most important events in the USSR and FRG, the mutual assistance to television and radio journalists in preparation of programs about the life of the peoples of the two countries and joint production of films for television are envisaged.

The document was signed by M.N.Nenashev, chairman of USSR Gostelradio, and F. Novotny, the WDR director.

Science Academy Head Attends FRG Forum

LD1106161490 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Abrosimov]

[Text] Kassel, Hessen June 11 TASS—The responsibility of science in the process of social transformations is the subject of a joint forum of Soviet and West German scientists which opened here today. It is organized on the initiative of Kassel University in conjunction with the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

The Soviet delegation is headed by Presidential Council member Yuriy Osipian, who is vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences and president of the Central Board of the Soviet-West German Society.

The time has borne out the timeliness of President Mikhail Gorbachev's idea that restructuring is needed not only in the Soviet Union but in the whole world, Professor Hans Rauschenberger said in his opening address at the forum.

"Morever, the world is already moving along the way of transformations, and it should be admitted that the movement was started by the Soviet Union," Rauschenberger said.

Professor Friedrich Neuman developed this idea by citing the recent Soviet-American summit which set an

example of how our civilization is moving step-by-step towards a nuclear-free future.

"The dialogue in Washington," the scientist said, "inspires hope that nuclear danger will be eliminated and a final turn towards peace will be taken".

"Scientists are called upon to make a notable contribution towards this," leader of the Soviet delegation Yuriy Osipian said. Assessing the discussion that has begun, he told TASS that it was unbiased and well-meaning and showed readiness to understand and accept each other's positions and differing approaches to processes and events.

"We wanted to transcend the limitations of common symposiums and conferences and combine purely scientific interests with an analysis of global issues of concern to the whole of mankind," Professor Heinrich Brinkman, Rector of Kassel University, said in an interview with TASS.

"I believe this approach is consistent with the spirit of the time. Scientists must not stand aloof from what is happening in the world," he said.

At the working session, which will last until June 13, participants in the forum are expected to discuss the entire range of economic, ecological and technological problems. They will conduct a comparative analysis of systems of education and training in the two countries and discuss the role of philosophy and sociology in the process of societal transformations. Conversion of military industries to peace-oriented production will also come under discussion.

The forum is being held within the framework of the festival of Soviet culture "Meet the Soviet Union" currently underway in Kassel.

European Trade Group To Help Train Managers

LD0706134590 Moscow TASS in English 1313 GMT 7 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Makarchev]

[Text] Geneva June 7 TASS—The European Free Trade Association EFTA is prepared to help the Soviet Union training managers of state and cooperative enterprises, Ake Landquist, one of the top officials of EFTA Secretariat, said in an interview with TASS. However, it is too early to raise the question of the Soviet Union's entry in EFTA.

The European Free Trade Association is the second largest commercial and economic amalgamation in Western Europe. The associaton comprises six countries: Austria, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. Their economy is based on the principles of free competition and market relations. EFTA central office is situated in Geneva.

Europe is now at cross roads and this also applies to the economy, Landquist said. There might be an advance in any direction, Landquist said. This is why EFTA favours creating the European economic zone, which would comprise any country.

The initial step would be the conclusion of a special commercial and economic agreement between EFTA and the European Economic Community. It is being drafted now. It is believed in EFTA that Eastern Europe could also become part of a new continental market.

Relations between East European countries and EFTA reached a new high this year. Landquist said it is expected that by the end of this year EFTA will have concluded a special agreement on free trade with Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland. The question of the possibility of these countries' joining EFTA has already been posed. But member-countries of the association do not limit themselves to Europe. Negotiations with Near Eastern and Persian Gulf countries about the establishment of mutually advantageous commercial deals are in progress.

UK Lawyers Plan To Aid Market Economy Switch

PM1106155590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent A. Lyutyy dispatch under the rubric "Meridians of Cooperation": "Speaking the Same Language. British-Soviet Association of Lawyers Formed"]

[Text] London, 10 Jun—After the solemn speeches at the Bar Association in London to mark the new British-Soviet undertaking, I asked one of its initiators—Stephen Rainer—straight: "What makes you and the other lawyers here go to all this trouble?"

"I will also tell you straight" S. Rainer said, "On the one hand altruism, and on the other practical interest. First, the Soviet Union needs help, including legal help. Our government is encouraging help of this kind. Second, Eastern Europe represents a huge market for Western business. Many of our clients among British companies intend to trade in that market. We want them to speak the same legal language as their partners."

The British-Soviet Association of Lawyers has been set up by the efforts of S. Rainer and his British and Soviet colleagues. It sees its task as being to maintain systematic contacts between the two countries' lawyers and offers the Soviet side specific professional aid in passing on experience in the sphere of jurisprudence.

The association's British participants decided as a first step to send their Soviet colleagues some facsimile machines in order to ensure more effective communications.

Over the next few months it planned to send Soviet lawyers special literature and invite them to acquaint themselves with the British legal system. The main emphasis, said David Winter, the association's chairman

on the British side, will be placed on studying the legal infrastructure of a market economy, and market laws.

Sitaryan, UK Customs Official Discuss Cooperation

LD0606165890 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—Stepan Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received today James Brian Unwin, chairman of the Board of H.M. Customs and Excise.

They discussed expanding cooperation between customs services of the USSR and Britain in exchanging experience in combating smuggling, specifically drug trafficking.

Soviet 'Antisubmarine Ship' Visits Taranto

PM1206130190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondent Captain Third Class Yu. Gladkevich report: "Meeting in Port of Taranto"]

[Text] A detachment of Soviet warships has arrived in the Italian port of Taranto for an official friendly visit. The large antisubmarine ship Ochakov and the guards large antisubmarine ship Krasnyy Krym arrived in Italy under the flag of Admiral M. Khronopulo, commander of the Black Sea Fleet.

The Soviet mariners were greeted in the port by representatives of the naval command and authorities of the city. On the first day of the stay in Taranto Adm. Khronopulo visited the commander of the military district and the prefect of Taranto.

Soviet Military Delegation Visits Belgium

LD1206163190 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov]

[Text] Brussels June 12 TASS—A delegation of Soviet land forces arrived in Belgium today at the invitation of the Belgian Defence Ministry.

The delegation is led by head of the Soviet land forces general staff Colonel-General Dmitriy Grinkevich.

The trip is taking place as part of a programme of contracts between the Soviet and Belgian Armed Forces. It includes meetings with representatives of the Belgian Supreme Command and visits to the Army headquarters and military units.

Parliamentary Delegation Visits Portugal

LD1306080190 Moscow TASS in English 0647 GMT 13 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Reshetilov]

[Text] Lisbon June 13 TASS—A delegation from the Soviet parliament's international affairs committee, now visiting here at the invitation of the Portuguese Parliament's foreign affairs commission has had a series of meetings with Portuguese political leaders. The sides discussed the expansion of contacts between Soviet and Portuguese parliamentarians, exchanged views on key international problems and processes occuring on the European Continent.

"It is now vitally important for us to inform each other on processes occuring on the European continent in order to influence them effectively," Portuguese Republican Assembly Chairman Vitor Pereira Crespo said.

Head of the Soviet delegation and vice chairman of the parliamentary Committee for International Affairs Anatoliy Ananyev described the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union. He stressed that it opened up favourable prospects for expanding relations between the two countries.

Portuguese Foreign Minister Joao de Deus Pinheiro said during a meeting at the Foreign Ministry that the Soviet Union and other East European countries should play a more active part in the work of European organisations, particularly in the European Council.

Netherlands Defense Minister To Visit in Jun

LD1406201490 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—Netherlands Defence Minister Relus ter Beek will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union in the second half of June at the invitation of his Soviet counterpart, Dmitriy Yazov, it has been announced here.

Remains of Finnish POW's Identified

LD0706215290 Moscow TASS in English 0810 GMT 7 Jun 90

[TASS correspondent Aleksandr Surikov report]

[Text] Helsinki, 7 June—Three hundred and thirteen Finnish soldiers and officers from the time of World War II are no longer counted as missing without trace. The fate of these people has been determined and given documentary confirmation by the Missing Persons' Bureau of the Soviet Red Cross. They were all taken into captivity and died at various times in POW camps territory of the USSR. A list of the servicemen giving their age, service rank, date and place of death, has been handed over in Helsinki to the Finnish side by Dmitriy Venediktov, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR.

Our missing persons' service, he told the TASS correspondent, worked all the post-war decades but only quite recently on the decision of the Soviet Government did we receive access to a number of previously closed

archives. Amid the currently observed increased interest in the results of World War II there is also a growing interest in the fates of specific people who fought on different sides of the front. With the discovery of the archives coms a real opportunity to conduct a truly careful search. The list handed to the Finnish Red Cross is the result of only the initial stage of this painstaking work. It is as yet hard to say how many names the next list will bear—a thousand or less, but it is already being prepared. Obviously, however, it will not be possible to follow with documentary precision the fate of each person who went missing. It is especially complex with those who were killed in combat and we have not been identified in the appropriate way. Moreover, it must be remembered that occupying forces' military cemeteries have not been preserved in our country. Whereas in the POW camps stock has been taken albeit with errors.

The search for those who went missing without trace in the years of the war is a two-way street. The Soviet Red Cross, Dmitriy Venediktov said, has inquiries to make on this count from many countries. Most of them of course, are from Germany, but citizens are also being sought from states which did not fight against us, France and Belgium for instance. We also have hundreds of thousands of requests for searches for Soviet citizens hitherto considered as being missing without trace. The search for them is the joint work of the national organisations of the Red Cross.

Environmental Cooperation With Finland Noted

LD1306124190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1713 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Helsinki, 12 Jun (TASS)—TASS correspondent Voytto Leskinen reports: Measures to protect the air and water on USSR and Finnish territory adjacent to the Soviet-Finnish border as well as prospects for developing ecological cooperation between the two countries were discussed at a meeting held today between the cochairmen of the Soviet-Finnish joint commission for cooperation in environmental protection.

A protocol on the meeting between K. Barlund, Finnish minister of environment, and N.N. Vorontsov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Nature Protection, stresses that the issue of reconstruction the Severonikel and Pechenganikel combines in Murmansk oblast will be examined before the end of this year. This will make it possible to formulate a plan of action to reduce the release of pollutants into the atmosphere.

The cochairmen of the joint commission decided to develop a Soviet-Finnish program to protect water resources and to envisage in this program measures aimed at cleansing the waters of the Gulf of Finland and other parts of the Baltic Sea. It is expected that this document will be signed at a forthcoming meeting of the commission in 1991.

In accordance with the protocol a permanent line of communication will be set up to provide for urgent exchange of information between the relevant organizations in the USSR and Finland in the event of an ecological catastrophe, as well as to prevent such catastrophes.

Varennikov Welcome Norwegian Major General

PM1406135590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Major General A. Sollie, inspector general of the Norwegian Ground Forces, has arrived in Moscow on an official visit. He was met at the airport by Army General V.I. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, and other officials.

O. Bucher Johannessen, Norwegian ambassador to the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

Maj. Gen. A. Sollie visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier near the Kremlin Wall 12 June.

The Norwegian guest familiarized himself with the organization of the training process and with classroom and laboratory equipment at the Armored Troops Military Academy.

Swedish Parliamentary Delegation Arrives

LD1406221290 Moscow TASS in English 2106 GMT 14 Jun 90

[BY TASS correspondent Peter Cheremushkin]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—a delegation of the Swedish Parliament's Foreign Affairs Commission arrived in Moscow on Thursday at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet's International Affairs Committee.

The delegation, including eight parliamentarians and led by commission chairman Stig Alemur, was received by Chairman of the Soviet Parliament's International Affairs Committee Aleksandr Dzasokhov and USSR people's deputies Nikolay Neiland and Fedor Burlatskiy.

They exchanged views on the two parliaments' cooperation, German unification and the situation in the Baltic republics.

Speaking about processes in Eastern Europe and united Germany's status, Dzasokhov said "The Soviet Union wants to see a European Germany rather than a German Europe." The Soviet side noted that political changes in Central Europe do not hamper the construction of a security system there.

Touching upon the situation in the Baltic republics, Dzasokhov noted that the "stance that 'Moscow tries to keep everybody in its fold' is wrong". The right of the

subjects of the Soviet Federation for self-determination should be exercised without haste, in a civilised manner and by collective efforts to elaborate a form of the peoples' and republics' coexistence that would retain statehood and take into account all specific of historic, cultural and political character and the peoples' traditions. "We cannot let perestroika be drowned in the Baltic Sea," he said.

Soviet and Swedish deputies spoke in favour of cooperation between the two countries in the sphere of ecology. They believe that it is necessary to switch to new economic relations in the region in order to save the Baltic Sea from polution and stabilise relations among the Baltic states.

Later in the day, the Swedish delegation met Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Kvitsinskiy.

the schedule of the two-day stay in Moscow includes a meeting with chairman of the USSR parliament's Soviet of Nationalities chamber Rafik Nishanov and a visit to the Soviet Academy of Sciences Institute of Europe. The delegation is also to visit Riga, the Latvian capital.

Supreme Soviet Session

Gorbachev Exchange With Deputies Cited

PM1306113790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Unattributed report on USSR Supreme Soviet deputies' question-and-answer exchange with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev following his speech to 12 June sitting of USSR Supreme Soviet's Third Session]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev went on to answer deputies' questions.

M.S. Gorbachev: Why did I not name Comrade Ismailov among those who helped and participated? There were many people I did not name. But I must say that Comrade Ismailov participated actively. I abide by this practice at the time of visits: A group of comrades travels out in advance and conducts an intensive, broad dialogue with the public, with the press, on television, at meetings in scientific centers. The burden is tremendous. When I flew from Canada to Washington, and we all gathered practically at nighttime to exchange thoughts, Comrade Ismailov expressed very interesting views and made observations as a result of his communication and contacts with the Americans. Well, I apologize to those I have not named. In general, you were right to remind me.

Comrade Koltsov asks: "In his report to Congress in March 1990 the U.S. President pointed out that the United States had rejected our proposals for talks on reducing naval forces. The same report set forth arguments on the unacceptable nature of such reductions for the United States. Does this mean that this U.S. position is forcing us to further develop the navy and, above all, to improve our large aircraft-carrying ships?"

M.S. Gorbachev: I believe that the matter and the process are developing in such a way that at subsequent stages we will also approach a discussion of arms of this kind too. But, for now, the Soviet-U.S. talks and the Vienna talks on the reduction of naval forces have been postponed until the next stage.

I must say—I also said this jokingly to the Americans—that in their administration there is a great predominance of representatives of those who once served in the U.S. Navy. And Mr. Bush himself was a naval pilot. This is probably indicative. Their navy is some kind of protected zone. I personally understand this. I believe that all military men and more or less experienced people understand this. What U.S. society consumes reaches the United States on a regular basis from the resources of the whole world. And in the matter of protecting lines of communication of vital importance to America the navy is regarded as a very important component of general policy, not to mention the fact that it is also, of course, an important component in rivalry. Nevertheless, I believe that at the subsequent stages we will also approach this favorite offspring of the U.S. Administration.

But I have not answered the second part. Comrade Gryazin has been shaking his head: Again the money will disappear somewhere, he says. We will examine the naval program in general, but I have not talked about aircraft carriers. A question has been asked about them, and I have said what I can say at present.

Comrade Moshnyaga's question: "Please tell us, the Supreme Soviet and the people's deputies, how much budget funds can be channeled into social programs as a result of signing the treaty on the reduction of strategic arms, chemical weapons, etc. Also please say by how many percentage points the military budget will diminish in connection with the said accords."

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Moshnyaga gets to the root of the matter. And so do we. Because we pursue two goals in realizing the principles of the new foreign policy. First, the creation of the necessary favorable external conditions for resolving tasks within the country and the general task of civilization—mankind's survival. This is the first point. And second: We want to unburden our economy. No economy has been as burdened as ours. Compare: We have ensured strategic parity with such a major country as the United States, which, according to the most modest estimates, produces twice as much as we do. This means that the United States has spent less of its national income on military needs than we have. In individual years, when Mr. Reagan acceded to power, U.S. military spending attained 8-10 percent of the national income. During those years we were spending considerably more than the United States in percentage terms. We are now examining all this with you. And we will act thoroughly to resolve both tasks. We cannot jeopardize the security of the people and the country. I do not wish now to expand on how to combine this with resolving the said tasks. But mistakes must not be repeated. For example, we built a lot of tanks, and now we are wondering what to do with them. In ensuring security we must ensure quality. And from this viewpoint everything is linked with military science We cannot permit laggardness in research work. Everything here must be resolved.

As for production of arms themselves, a careful look must be taken at this. We will resolve this task by other criteria.

We will discuss this together in the fall. Specifically, it is too early to say exactly what form this will take, but I must say that the savings will be great. Another question arises. We must now work out thoroughly our approaches to conversion. We did so many foolish things at the initial stage, when we began using good production capital and the cadre potential of our military-industrial complex and the defense sector for trifling matters. There may be a big loss here. But this has now been realized. Very interesting programs have emerged. We

are arriving at a national conversion program which will make full use of the defense sector's potential for resolving the tasks that arise in connection with our economy's turn toward people.

Comrades Kuznetsov or Kuznetsova and Tikhonenkov from Kazakhstan ask: "Were any global ecological problems the subject of the talks with the President?"

Yes, they were, and from the viewpoint that we must cooperate right now. Specific questions of cooperation have already become apparent on at least two points. These are European cooperation and also cooperation in the Arctic with Canada and the United States. In this connection a second question is asked: Does the realization of the Tengiz project pose any danger from the ecological viewpoint?

No. A thorough study has been made. What is proposed will provide very interesting technology which maybe can be used in other places.

Nikolay Vasilyevich Neyland says that at the news conference with Mitterrand I proposed the idea of NATO membership for a united Germany in the French manner, i.e. being a member of the political organization but not the military one. First, on more profound study—I discussed this with President Bush, particularly at Camp David, where the degree of frankness was very high—it turned out, you know, that all this is a myth, for NATO's plans take account of France's armed forces. And intelligence has reported the same thing to us. This is the first point.

Second, the option that we might reach is, I believe, more reliable. At the Political Consultative Committee session we decided to reform the Warsaw Pact—and to do so quickly—to develop it strongly in a political direction within a year and to change its structure on the basis of the defensive doctrine that has been drawn up and already confirmed. The Political Consultative Committee appeal was compiled very positively, and it will be followed by practical deeds. And if the NATO Council in summit session in London in July does not find it necessary and expedient to respond, we have a right to particular criticism of that stance. Does the West really believe that movement must happen on our side alone? Therefore I say: The West must change too. Incidentally, changes are already taking place. And there are many problems there that prompt changes. We spoke of them when I was flying in a helicopter with the President over Washington's suburbs. The problems may be on a different level, but there are very many of them. And we need, the President said, a policy—both domestic and foreign—which will facilitate their resolution.

If NATO takes the same path as the Political Consultative Committee, a real opportunity will open up for concluding agreements between them. I have already spoken of this on a practical plane with Mrs. Thatcher, and we even reflected on the structure of a possible declaration—which this document could enshrine.

Thus, today, with both blocs changing both their doctrines and the structure of their armed forces and with arms being reduced on the basis of the Vienna talks, the possibility is opening up, along with the blocs' political transformation, of creating all-European security structures on the basis of the structures that still exist at present. We propose: Why not also have some supra-alliance organ which would listen to both sides' reports, carry out exchanges, monitor the degree of trust, etc. Why not preserve the commitments to the respective alliances? Not to mention the fact that the Bundeswehr must be reduced accordingly, and let it be subordinate to NATO, while on the territory of the present GDR the troops—which have also been reduced—must come under an all-German government and not be a part of the NATO armed forces. The question of our troops is to be decided accordingly. And when you make such a list, you end up with some new associative form which we should think up together. A whole range of problems, quite specific problems, is accumulating. And all this must of course be synchronized somehow with the building of all-European structures within the framework of forming a common economic, legal, and cultural expanse and, of course, a military—that is, security—expanse.

We do not demand that it be our own version. It could come from others, from Mrs. Thatcher, for example, just as long as it is in the general interests.

Does the second question require an answer or not? No. There will be an answer, Nikolay Vasilyevich.

Question by Comrade Dzhumatova: "Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, there has not been a war in Europe for over 40 years, and this is precisely because of nuclear deterrence. But this has been achieved at the expense of the health of people living around the Semipalatinsk test site. How are we going to compensate the damage done to people living in test site areas?"

M.S. Gorbachev: We are looking into this closely with you. Not one source of concern is being ignored. Science, not only military science but also our big-league science, has become involved in this work. You now have an organization which, as far as I am aware, is headed by Comrade Suleymenov. The problem of the Semipalatinsk test site is being studied closely. Even now its regulations are being made a lot tighter. I repeat, we are taking this responsibly and seriously. Some would like to see it closed down, I do realise this, and we will work toward this. People are raising the question of closing down the test site completely. We cannot do this at present. But we are doing everything to ensure that people are protected against any accidents and that the possibility of accidents is ruled out completely. The problem is being monitored by the president and the government.

Comrade Kirillov asked a question: Do you not feel the need to depoliticize the Soviet Army in light of German unification, Germany's dual membership of NATO and

the Warsaw Pact, the political changes in the Warsaw Pact countries, and the inevitable assumption of power by different parties in various Soviet republics?

Answer: No, I do not feel the need.

Some questions from Comrade Nazarenko: The first question. Nakhodka is called a free enterprise zone. Does this mean that similar zones cannot be created in other parts of the country?

Answer: No, it does not mean that. I think practice will show where else this need will arise. In one case, with border trade, and, in another, with joint enterprises, which are evidently the main direction. But objections may arise. There are different opinions on this at present. The zones can only be created when everyone is in agreement. It seems that people would like to see a similar zone created in Novgorod or Pskov, but great contradictions have arisen: Agreement must always be reached. And this can only be done on the basis of accord.

The second question is about conversion. Is there an accord on exchanging experience?

We talked about this with the president. We even wondered whether to try this jointly at several enterprises. There is a joint project. It is making headway with difficulty. But it is very interesting and very promising. I am referring to an aircraft. In its construction we are cooperating on the engines and partially on the instruments with American firms, while Israel is involved with the cockpit instrumentation. The prospects are very good. The aircraft is in demand, it will have a huge market. Calculations show that we can generate 5 billion or even 10 billion in profits.

Comrade Desyatov from Komsomolsk-na-Amure asks: "Do the center's plans envisage the participation of Eastern and Western countries—the United States, Canada, Korea, and Japan, in particular—in opening up the Far East and developing its productive forces?"

M.S. Gorbachev: I think this process has already begun, but it is still at the clarification stage, so to speak. It seems to me that some interesting joint work awaits us in that region. But we must be careful to avoid any detriment to us—economic or otherwise—for the peoples living in the Far East.

Chairman: I think that is enough questions, comrades, or are there some more?

M.S. Gorbachev: There are still quite a lot left. Perhaps we should not take any more questions? I will just answer these.

Question: Will the agreements signed in the United States, particularly the agreement with Chevron on developing the Tengiz deposits, be submitted for ratification to the USSR Supreme Soviet?

Answer: We have to look into the matter of whether these resolutions and agreements will be submitted for ratification. Or whether they will just be discussed in the committees. We have to look into this.

Question: Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, did you bring up the idea at your meeting with Bush of swapping presidents for a short while? (Laughter in the auditorium.) Would you not like to run America for a while? (Laughter in the auditorium.)

Answer: I respect the humor... This, generally speaking, is a double hint, reading between the lines: Namely, could Bush help us to do something? Okay, I will consider why this question was asked by Deputy Belous.

Question: I have been asked for the grain purchase figure...

Answer: Between eight and 14 million tonnes.

Question: "How will military expenditure be cut in the event of some East European countries leaving the Warsaw Pact?" "Will military expenditure be increased or reduced if some member countries leave the Warsaw Pact?"

Answer: We will work according to our plans. I am also aware of something else: Some people believe that if the bloc ceases to function or if some state leaves it, our national army must be increased in size. That until now we have relied on the bloc.

Question: "Is there a process under way in the United States that is similar to the conversion of military production in the Soviet Union? If so, what kind of difficulties are being experienced?"

Answer: In my opinion their difficulties are the same as ours. The military-industrial complex is always opposed to output being cut.

Question: "The Lithuanian factor and trade agreements."

Answer: As you will have noticed, in all the President's speeches the ratification of a trade agreement was linked with our adopting a law on entry into and exit from the country.

Question: "Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich! Is a nuclear-free world reality or myth? Is it necessary to maintain nuclear arms at some level nevertheless, as a deterrence factor?"

Answer: Your view coincides with Mrs. Thatcher's view. And since you are from Kiev, her statements have probably influenced you. (Laughter) I have been discussing this question with her since 1984, and so far she has not influenced me. Look at what is happening: On 15 January 1986 we announced a program for achieving a nuclear-free, nonviolent world. The initial responses to it

were that it was an illusion! International affairs specialists will remember this. That is correct, is it not, Comrade Burlatskiy and Comrade Velikhov?

The "illusion" is now looking like this: Intermediate-range missiles have been destroyed and we are very close to signing a treaty on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive arms. So let us continue following the path on which we have embarked. I think that since Chernobyl we must be even more convinced that this is the path to follow.

One reactor unit at one nuclear power plant blew up. And our vast country still has not coped with the consequences. More and more new problems are arising. We have spent R14 billion already. This madness is a nuclear war, albeit a very localized nuclear war. Although it cannot really be localized.

All this means that a nuclear-free world is a great political objective. We must work toward it.

Question by Deputy Petrushenko: In an interview with NEDELYA, the president of the "Nevada Movement" justified the need for and advisability of unilateral nuclear disarmament. What have President Bush and President Gorbachev got to say about this?

Answer: Well, I cannot speak for President Bush, but I am sure that he will be against this idea. For the moment... We, for example, are constantly proposing a halt to nuclear tests. We have made this proposal so often... But nothing happens... As far as the advisability of unilateral nuclear disarmament is concerned, I think the path we are following is more correct. We are moving along this path together. This is shedding a considerable amount of light, verification and cooperation are being established, and a different degree of trust is emerging. Let us continue in this direction. Where necessary, we have taken unilateral measures, particularly in areas where we clearly had "excesses" [flyusy], as you know. It is sometimes necessary to take a unilateral step in order to get things moving, so to speak. This is politics, strategy, and tactics—everything is considered. Sometimes it is not clear to everyone why we have suddenly taken a certain step. I do not rule out the possibility of unilateral measures. But if we are talking about nuclear arms reductions and disarmament, then, I repeat, we are on the right road. We have eliminated intermediate-range nuclear missiles. We are making 50-percent cuts in strategic arms. Now Mr. Bush has agreed to talks on tactical and nuclear weapons, and we have conditionally agreed to begin these talks after an agreement has been reached in Vienna.

Comrade Kerimov asks whether the question of the further development of international cooperation on human rights was discussed.

Answer: The human rights question is ever present at all talks between us.

Comrade Peters asks whether the question of transforming the Baltic republics into a nuclear-free zone or, better still, a demilitarized zone was discussed?

Answer: It was not discussed in those specific terms.

A question that requires a whole page. Comrade Tsybukh asks on his committee's behalf: "Did the presidents discuss the question of ties between our young people and the intensification of those ties?"

It was not only discussed... As I have already said, cooperation in the exchange of students has even been expanded. I fully support this matter. Look at what happened at Stanford University when I walked about 1.5 km past 10,000 students... I have never experienced anything like that anywhere in my entire life. All who were in Stanford with me experienced that. The mood of the young people was very good. They were uninhibited, they expressed their thoughts and feelings openly, they asked all sorts of questions—with great sympathy for everything that we are doing here. And I believe that it is precisely among young people that contacts should be developed. It is easier for young people to establish them, they have fewer hang-ups. It is easier for them to establish relationships and maintain them. I believe we should welcome this development in every way.

Question: Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich! Many serious accords with the United States are made dependent on events in the Baltic. What are your immediate plans with regard to these republics?

Answer: I think that they are the same as yours. I hope that they do not differ here. It will not help if they do... But first of all... The United States does not make the whole range of relations with us—which has already been formed and is gaining momentum—dependent on this problem, although it shows a keen interest in it. That is the first point. Your assertion that the United States makes such a dependence is surely an exaggeration.

What are my immediate plans? You and I—the president, the Government, and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR—have a single common mandate from the Third Congress of People's Deputies, which deemed the decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet invalid and unlawful. That is the first point.

Next. As you know, I have in mind here Comrade Sobchak: He is a coauthor of this resolution although, apparently, judging by his interview—it will have to be looked at—he has already forgotten that fact and I am reminding him now. We all have this weakness—of forgetting what we said two days ago, let alone two weeks ago. So, we wrote in this document that we recognize and confirm the constitutional right to self-determination. Nevertheless, the president was instructed to do everything to protect the constitutional system, to safeguard citizens' constitutional rights, and to create the conditions which would make it possible to realize the right to self-determination in constitutional forms.

I shall say frankly that I intend to take a broad approach to this problem. The congress rejected [otmenil] the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet resolution, deemed it unlawful, and demanded that it be revoked [otmenit]. That is all there is to it. There would seem to be no room for maneuver.

From the floor: It must be revoked.

Gorbachev: It must be revoked. I believe that if the act on state independence adopted by the Lithuanian republic is suspended talks may begin. Suspended—even if only for the duration of the talks. But the pre-10 March situation is returning. I hope that this will be understood in society. I get many telegrams nowadays: They talk about how "strong" the leaders of the Baltic republics are and how "weak" our president is. What they mean is that the president still has not used everything at his disposal. I think that we are nevertheless on the right track in seeking political solutions. It is difficult, very difficult, but this must be our choice. This does not rule out the fact that life may make us take all sorts of measures. And our friends in the Baltic should be aware of that. If life demands—and such is life—then we will do everything necessary to protect the Constitution. Some discussions have started now, apparently... I can hear a familiar voice objecting... Comrade Kogan...

As long as you and the country tolerate this president I shall shoulder the responsibility. I hear everything, all the opinions and judgments. But you know what would happen if there stood before you a man who panicked at the first setback—especially when such fundamental changes are taking place in the country, when the whole political system is changing, when we are embarking on a new model of the economy and a new federation because our state cannot live any other way, when what are essentially different, new forms of life and a qualitatively new society are coming into being. And anyone who tries to convince me that he can produce some magic wand which he will wave and, he promises, put everything right by switching to the market economy straight away, I say to him: This is claptrap. Pardon me for using a Ukrainian word when speaking in Russian. We must do everything to minimize the difficulties and get through this period less painfully, particularly when it affects people on low or fixed incomes and so forth. We must do everything to protect living standards. But those who say that all this will be painless and easy have understood nothing at all. And they are trying to foist this misunderstanding on society and the people.

Comrade Kogan is constantly egging me on to take "revolutionary" actions. (Laughter in the auditorium.) But I believe, comrades, that we must find an answer by political means, and it is already taking shape. Let all our friends from the Baltic ponder the formula—suspend the decisions that have been adopted even if only for the duration of the talks, the discussion.

The Council of the Federation is going to meet today. And we are going to begin discussing all these vital questions. How to reform our federation—let us consider all this and act accordingly. In my opinion, good preconditions have been created to really breathe new life into our union of sovereign states while preserving all the advantages which may be derived from remaining in the Union, all the benefits of cooperation. I believe that we will find the answer on this path. I hope, comrades, that you will treat this approach with understanding, let us not lose our nerve. I do not want relations with the Baltic republics and the Baltic peoples in the Supreme Soviet or in the country as a whole to be spoiled, or conditions for people of other nationalities living there to become intolerable as a result. I rule that out. It will do the Balts no good, it will do us no good—we have lived alongside each other for centuries and must cooperate. It is necessary to find correct answers, not to go mad or tear everything apart at the seams.

Comrades from Murmansk asked a question: I talked about Semipalatinsk and said that measures are being taken to reduce tests at the site. But that will increase the burden on Novaya Zemlya, they say. We always examine this question together. The point of Comrade Suleymenov's demand is that the Semipalatinsk site should be closed anyway. Is that right, Comrade Suleymenov? Generally speaking, in principle I support that. I understand your wish. But everything must be weighed up. The country's security is our common fate. There can be no hasty decision here. Let us go on studying this question. It affects everyone: Those who live in Kazakhstan, in the North, and in other parts of the country, too.

Comrade Prikhodko from the Transcarpathians says that the question of building a radar station has become acute. He asks whether the question of ending the construction of that station was discussed. But this question is our internal affair. Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko must tell us the status of the question of this radar station... I think it will be investigated.

I thank you for your attention, comrades. (Applause)

Activities for 14 Jun Session Reported

PM1406213190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Morning Edition pp 1,2

[IZVESTIYA parliamentary correspondents V. Dolganov and A. Stepovoy Kremlin report: "The Value of Bread and Bread Prices"]

[Text] According to the tentative schedule for the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet Third Session 14 June was meant to be the last day, but, when opening the morning plenary sitting, Chairman A.I. Lukyanov said the following: "We are coming to the final round of the session. We must work harmoniously today in order to wind things up tomorrow."

At the morning sitting our parliamentarians began for the fifth time examining the draft law on taxes levied on enterprises, associations, and organizations. Deputy

A.N. Saunin acquainted the session's participants with the changes and addenda that have been made. The draft law then began to be ratified article by article.

It was planned to return at the evening sitting to the question of new retail prices for bread and bread products, which was the subject of such stormy discussion the day before.

The adoption of the resolution "On the Concept for the Transition to a Regulated Market Economy in the USSR" occupied the bulk of our parliament's time 13 June. In the course of their work deputies turned not only to the official draft of this document which was prepared by a number of committees and commissions, along with the USSR Council of Ministers, but also to the initiative document. Its authors—a large group of people's deputies, including Ye.A. Kutepov, V.V. Davituliani, A.V. Reshetnikov, O.I. Markov, A.O. Dobrovolskiy, V.I. Kisin, and many others—gave their document a somewhat different title—"On the Country's Economic Position and the Concept for the Transition to a Regulated Market Economy." The draft proved to be to the point—a number of provisions from the original version were clarified in its spirit, while some have been transposed outright to the final text.

The resolution will soon by published, and readers will, we hope, be able to see its strong points and weak points for themselves. That is why there is probably no point in relating episodes in the tense and resolute struggle that was sometimes conducted not so much as regards whole points, sections, and clauses but even over the placing of individual words. The picture of our economy as it is now, and which must be "redrawn" virtually from scratch after the protracted 70-year experiment, emerged at the same time from deputies' comments and speeches. This was mentioned by People's Deputies P.M. Klishchuk, V.P. Grishchuk, Yu.T. Komarov, G.A. Yenokyan, B.S. Safarov, Yu.Yu. Boldyrev, and others.

Deputy I.N. Gryazin trenchantly raised the question of the effectiveness of the activity of the Supreme Soviet itself. Many of our very good laws and good intentions are not fulfilled by anyone, including the government. Is it capable of fulfilling the present resolution? Does it boast a sufficient credit of trust—not among us, but among the people—to implement this extremely good resolution?

This question, which was also voiced at many previous sittings during the current protracted session, was raised with extreme trenchancy 13 June. While backing the draft resolution, Yu.K. Sharipov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Questions of the Social and Economic Development of Union and Autonomous Republics and Autonomous Oblasts and Okrugs, nevertheless passed the following comment: The union government cannot bear the burden of the problems of switching to a market on its own. There is not, unfortunately, any clear realization of these realities within the country's top echelons of government or within the Supreme Soviet itself. One gets the impression that neither the government nor other bodies with the right to legislative initiative are taking into consideration the existence of the new republic parliaments which are ready to undertake—and are already undertaking—the bulk of legislative work in the socioeconomic sphere.

Deputy I.B. Shamshev voiced doubts as to the feasibility of the government's allotted dates for finalizing and concretizing the program for the transition to the market—by 1 September. What about a nationwide discussion?—he wondered. Why hold this discussion in principle before 20 August if we do not effectively have a version of the government's finalized program?

How do you propose to hold the so-called nationwide discussion, and who will sum up its results? A.A. Sobchak addressed this question to his colleague A.N. Boyko, who was submitting the draft resolution on behalf of a number of committees, commissions, and the Council of Ministers (the government is also among its coauthors). He himself replied, not content with explanations: You will not have the people's opinion, but the opinion of the corresponding organs of power in the localities, which will undoubtedly submit it to you in the requisite form.

The Leningrad Soviet chairman, who has not renounced his powers as member of the Supreme Soviet and who has not withdrawn from its work, also demanded clarification on the measures which will help to stabilize and saturate the market: the introduction of strict economy measures in respect of state spending on the upkeep of all types of apparatus; the cessation of all free aid to other countries and the adoption of measures to recover debts from these countries.

A reasonable comment. Given our own present indigence, we cannot engage in philanthropic activity, which is, moreover, often in favor of totalitarian regimes that do not enjoy the backing of their own people. This idea has been voiced with increasing frequency within our parliament.

The resolution was discussed at length, the result being that all its articles were clarified and adopted. Then the examination of another resolution—"On the Procedure for Introducing New Retail Prices for Bread and Bread Products"—was heralded by an emotional outburst and certain local denunciations. Yu.D. Maslyukov, chairman of the country's Gosplan [State Planning Commission], did not have time to finish his report, which was lavishly interlarded with assurances that the republics do not object to a 300-percent increase in retail prices on all bread products without exception, before the union republics' representatives themselves angrily demanded explanations.

Deputy T.V. Moshnyaga: "Why did you call the deputy chairman of the Moldavian Gosplan the deputy chairman of the government? Is he empowered to decide such a difficult question on behalf of the republic, its people, and the legislative?" Deputy I.P. Zelinskiy

declared the country's parliament to be acting tactlessly in principle if it decided to consider the problem of raising bread prices without having the decisions of the union republic Supreme Soviets at its disposal. It is well known that these decisions are extremely different from the opinion held by middle-ranking republic state planning officials.

Deputy A.A. Korshunov deemed Yu.D. Maslyukov's comparison between bread prices in the United States and in our country to be a tactless one. The notorious $2 (our press has already cited figures showing the ratio between $2 and the average wage of the ordinary American worker) do not reflect the real state of affairs on the question of the purchasing power of the dollar and the ruble, and the means and standard of living of American and Soviet citizens.

Yu.D. Maslyukov, the deputy continued, having read out cables from several leaders, is trying to present these as the opinion of the people. Deputies from Uzbekistan resolutely state that their voters are categorically opposed to this. We must not act like this at all with all our poor Soviet people. No compensation will affect market prices that have already rocketed upward and will probably rise still further. The country's government is virtually ignoring the opinion of the Uzbek Supreme Soviet. Incidentally, A.A. Korshunov recalled, the government raised bread prices quite recently on the pretext of an improvement in bread quality. Where is the quality?. Where is the range? Where is the new equipment capable of producing bread of a far better quality with a reduction in needless expenditure that was promised before the previous hike.

I would certainly interested to find out, Deputy R.A. Medvedev said, what steps the government is taking to reduce unproductive losses en route from the grainfield to the store. How much of the grain that is cultivated fails to reach our tables owing to disorder and mismanagement on the part of the state itself?

It is a pity that the deputy who toughly demanded that the government stop making do with promises and finally provide rural workers with fuel and other necessary resources did not give his name. The situation with regard to supplies of fuel and lubricants for equipment is now extremely alarming again. A deputy read out the following cable from the Ukraine: Work has been at a standstill for several days now in Kharkov Oblast's grain-producing Bogodukhovskiy Rayon for precisely this reason.

Chairman A.I. Lukyanov literally rescued a top government official (who is, moreover, part of the country's political leadership) from a whole volley of extremely unpleasant questions which Yu.D. Maslyukov—let us be honest and admit this—answered primarily with generalities or evaded discussing specifically altogether. The examination of the "bread" resolution was put off "till later." As A.I. Lukyanov said, it is postponed until the Union government is familiarized with the official opinion of the union republics' new parliaments.

The question of "transforming" the USSR Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises into a concern was postponed for the second time. Minister V.G. Chirskov did not succeed in convincing deputies that the planned step is not the latest trick by an apparatus that wants to retain the former monopolistic state structures in a new guise. Deputies also voiced perplexity over the fact that neither the relevant parliamentary committee nor a number of other permanent entities evidently knew of the ministry's planned transformation into a concern. And Deputy K.D. Lubenchenko described this bluntly as the former administrative-edict officials' moving house while retaining virtually all their advantages.

By and large that is the difficult way in which the third session of our parliament, which examined another question 13 June in addition to the aforementioned questions on the agenda, is coming to a close. It only took a few minutes to ratify the Convention on the Protection of the Child.

The close of the session scheduled for 14 June has been postponed.

Moscow TV Reports 14 Jun Supreme Soviet Session

LD1406233690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2148 GMT on 14 June begins carrying a recorded relay of the 14 June USSR Supreme Soviet session from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 2150 GMT a deputy discusses payment for natural resources as component of costs. A taxation bill is being debated. It also deals with labor costs. He advocates distribution of tax rates between the Union and autonomous republics. He talks about the technical problems of drafting the bill. On ecology: An ecological tax has been proposed; the RSFSR Council of Ministers has passed such a measure of its own. This question needs thorough study. Fines must be imposed for dangerous production. Article 6 deals with "profit benefits." Countless bodies claim tax concessions. Careful analysis is needed. Many categories of concessions have been considered. A misprint in draft is corrected.

At 2205 GMT Chairman Lukyanov suggests going through the text of the draft law, which took eight months to draw up.

At 2206 GMT Kucherenko says present taxation will be retained till 1 January, 1991. The bill is then debated, article by article. A deputy complains that the tax is removing the incentive to work—in the case of dairymaids, for example. (Maskevich) of the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems then says tax rates will take various factores such as skill, difficult conditions, etc. into account, and explains how this will help the

dairymaids. Lukyanov recalls principle of "equal pay for equal work," mentioned in the Constitution.

At 2210 GMT a deputy urges including a provision on compulsory social and medical insurance for workers and their families. Lukyanov says not only tax laws, but many others will have to be amended when insurance scheme is introduced. Kucherenko discusses the various forms of medical insurance around the world. A vote is taken on whether to include an amendment on medical insurance; it is passed.

At 2220 GMT announcer says nearly all amendments are passed without further debate; bill as whole is passed. The question of raising bread price is addressed. It had previously been postponed. Unnamed deputy reads out the solution which the government prefers, stating proposed prices of various bread products and of grain. He recalls decisions previously taken on keeping retail prices down, some of which must be amended. Government proposes that a final decision be made on raising bread prices. Announcer says prices bill was passed; miner spoke; Akhromeyev and Lopakhin also spoke.

At 2235 GMT a deputy warns against seeking a solution to the country's crisis without the republics taking each other's interests into account. Joint effort is needed to create a free market.

At 2240 GMT vote is taken on the bill. It is passed. Lukayanov says session is now ending. He reviews its work. Thirty major bills have been passed. He lists some of them, stressing how much work has gone into them. Eight important international agreements were ratified. There have been many shortcomings at the session. Next session will deal with about 30 bills, including the market economy and the status of deputies. Criticism will be answered with practical deeds. He lists a timetable for future sessions. The Supreme Soviet can tackle big problems head-on. He thanks all for their efforts and sends greetings to voters.

At 2247 GMT the recorded relay ends.

Enterprise Taxation System Law Adopted

LD1406151490 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Kirill Dibrova and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—The Soviet Parliament today adopted a bill on taxation of enterprises, amalgamations and organisations.

The new law envisages a common taxation system for enterprises, irrespective of who owns them, and removes all payments to ministries' funds.

The law sets the following kinds of all-union taxes—on profits, turnover, exports and imports, income, growth in means allocated for consumption and collective farms wage funds.

The law determines that the basic profits tax rate amounts to 45 per cent. Twenty-two per cent of it goes to the union budget and up to 23 per cent—to republican and local budget.

Other tax rates are determined for some categories of enterprises. State specialised banks, commercial and cooperative banks, insurance organisations will pay 55 per cent, joint enterprises with a foreign share over 30 per cent—30 per cent (such enterprises in the Far Eastern Economic Region—ten per cent).

In addition, the law envisages that joint ventures in the material production sphere are exempt from paying profits taxes in the first two years of profitability (joint ventures in the Far Eastern Economic Region—for three years). An exception is made for mining and fishing enterprises.

The law determines a preferential taxation of profits allocated for scientific, research, experimental and design work, the mastering of progressive technologies, nature protection and organisations with social, cultural and charity aims.

A 30 per cent tax rate has been determined for foreign enterprises. Preferential terms are granted to them on the part of profits allocated for nature protection measures on Soviet territory and charity.

The law goes into effect on January 1, 1991.

Lukyanov Closes Supreme Soviet Session 14 Jun

LD1406215190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Speech by Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov at the 14 June third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Dear comrades, I would like to say a few words at the close of this session. The session was extremely unusual. It lasted four months and it included, as it were, the Congress of People's Deputies, the extraordinary congress which elected the president of our country. The session was also very unusual in that, whereas the first session adopted 10 laws and the second adopted 10, today we adopted, according to my calculations, the 30th major legislative act and a large number of decisions. You can see the block of economic laws, very important laws, such as the laws on property, on land, on local self-government, a whole range of questions connected with the tax system. All of this has passed through our minds and our hearts and through our work.

You can see the large block of questions connected with the social system and with giving help to our working people. These include the law on pensions, the decision on giving help to women and large families, the provisions on young people. All of these were the subjects of our careful discussion. You can see the large series of laws, the whole range of laws on interethnic relations. There is no doubt that they will form the basis for the

large amount of work which lies ahead of us for adopting, along with all the republics, the new union treaty.

You can see the range of major acts connected with our legal system, including such acts as juries, the provisions on internal troops, on the state of emergency, on the changes to the criminal and criminal procedure legislation. These are also steps in the construction and strengthening of our democracy.

We affirmed and ratified eight major international agreements. We listened to a report from the president on the very important steps by our country to implement the principles of the new thinking.

We conveyed two major draft laws for nationwide discussion, and we passed five in their first reading.

That is the volume of work that we have done. Of course, there were many shortcomings. There were shortcomings in the preparation of the draft laws, in elaborating the mechanism for applying them. I think that one of the weakest points in our work was the poor work aimed at monitoring the application of the legislation and the implementation of the new laws. This is something that we have to master, and to master on a broad scale, both in the work of the committees and commissions and also in the work of the Supreme Soviet itself, and of the deputies in the localities.

What are we going to do next? Right now, at the next session of the Supreme Soviet...[Lyukanov pauses] and we shall be sending you a prospectus of the laws that we will be working on. There are about 30 of them for the next session. They contain a whole series of monitoring questions which we will have to examine in connection with the changeover to regulated market relations. We will be sending out to you in the localities—literally in five days time—a large amount of material on the results of the work of the Supreme Soviet at this session and practically for the past year. We will be sending you—and we have already passed it out—the new law on the status of deputies, and we will try to supply you with the necessary materials.

What are our thoughts on the way to structure our coming work? You could make use of the first days of your parliamentary break to hold meetings with electors, to deliver a report on the work which we have conducted. I would like you to convey to them our fears, the work we have conducted, and our concerns with which these months have been filled, and to say at the same time that we intend to respond to any criticism there has been—not only in the localities but also in Moscow—we intend to by our deeds, first and foremost by our deeds.

On my own behalf, on behalf of the chairmen of the chambers, on behalf of the president, I would like to say, comrades—and I think that you will support me on this—over the past year a collective has been formed here. I cannot say a collective of people all thinking the same, that would be incorrect, but of people with different experience, with different thoughts, with different views, a collective capable of attacking head on the most difficult questions, capable of creating new documents, capable of moving forward and living in the thick of our country's affairs. That could well be our greatest achievement, and each of you has contributed your great labor to this.

We would like to give heart-felt thanks to you and the thousand people's deputies who worked in the committees and commissions. And at times up to 200 people's deputies who are not members of the Supreme Soviet took part in each of our sessions. To all of these we wish you great success, we ask you to convey greetings and best wishes for calm, self-possessed and harmonious work to our electors so that they can continue the lofty mission which our Soviet people, our electors, our present day and our future have laid upon the Supreme Soviet. I wish you great success, comrades.

Ryzhkov Interviewed on Economic Reform Measures

PM1406192190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev report: "Take Cognizance of... At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] The parliament allocated a week for work on the government's new economic program in committees and commissions. But this obviously was not enough. It was only after 10 days that the USSR Supreme Soviet members continued discussing at the joint sitting of the chambers the transition to a regulated market economy. Their attention was directed to the draft resolution on N.I. Ryzhkov's report.

To be brief, the resolution's essence resides, first, in the fact it is suggested cognizance be taken of the government report. Second, the USSR Council of Ministers has been instructed to submit by 1 September a concrete program of measures regarding the formation—starting this year—of the structure of and mechanism for a regulated market economy. It has been deemed advisable to hold a nationwide discussion of the government's proposals in respect of guarantees for the population's social protection, particularly of its impoverished strata. Other major measures also have been outlined whose implementation will help create a market structure.

During the recess, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's parliamentary correspondents, among other journalists, put questions to N.I. Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman. Here is a brief record of this lightning interview.

[Correspondents] Are you sure the government's proposed measures will improve the people's well-being?

[Ryzhkov] I am sure that there is simply no other way for us now. We are on the edge—we have abandoned the rigid administrative-planning system under which we lived for decades and are switching to self-financing, economic accountability [khozraschet], and autonomy

for enterprises. We cannot fall between two stools any longer. There is, of course, the opinion we must return to our point of departure and reintroduce the rigid planning system. What are we criticizing, then? Why did we fail to secure the people's well-being during these years, then? So, we must move on and find a model enabling us to resolve these questions. At least now we have the prospect of leading a normal life at some time, as people do throughout the world.

[Correspondents] B.N. Yeltsin said at the Russian Congress of People's Deputies there is a more constructive program for transferring to a market economy which does not impose such a burden on the people. Are you familiar with it?

[Ryzhkov] I have run through many varying proposals. I did not see a program of this kind specifically—namely, clearly-articulated, with calculations. I do not believe we can implement reform and switch to a regulated market without touching the price system. I do not believe this, because all the prices are distorted in our country and do not give us an opportunity to work. We have just stood and talked to the miners' representative. Ask him to talk about his attitude toward wholesale prices. The coal industry today has a profitability rating of minus 15 percent. What kind of economic accountability can there be here? If we are talking about retail prices, they can ultimately be left as they are. But then half our national income will be spent on subsidies.

[Correspondents] Nikolay Ivanovich, tell us, did you expect this reaction from the population to the proposals to raise prices for bread products?

[Ryzhkov] I expected this reaction to the price hikes as a whole because we have inculcated the following opinion in our people over the decades: We are strong because we do not touch prices, and they are very low in our country. All this ran into contradictions in the economy, and it began to operate ineffectively. As for the reaction to the proposal to raise bread prices, to be honest, I thought society was more prepared for this. After all, anyone who is a bit older knows the meaning of bread. I receive a colossal number of cables and letters in which people demand we finally restore order regarding bread. [Ryzhkov ends]

The concept for transferring to a regulated market economy in the USSR was adopted after a protracted debate and voting on all points. The draft resolution on the procedure for introducing new retail prices for bread and bread products also provoked many disputes. Discussion of this resolution was postponed at the chair's suggestion.

Political & Social

Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress

Democratic Platform Viewed

WA0506191790 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 21, 26 May-1 Jun 90 p 8

[Reader's letter and response by V. Lysenko, 28th CPSU Congress delegate and member of the Coordinating Council of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU]

[Text] **I would like to know if supporters of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU intend to participate in the work of the 28th Party Congress following publication of the Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee?**

[Signed] D. Khargiyanova, Moscow

V. Lysenko, 28th CPSU Congress delegate and member of the Coordinating Council of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU, responds to this question.

We should note that attitudes among Democratic Platform adherents toward the coming 28th CPSU Congress are diverse. Some participants in the movement (34 percent, according to a public opinion poll conducted by sociologists of the Moscow Higher Party School) believe they must go to the congress and strive there to achieve democratic changes, including the right to create factions. Irrespective of the results of the congress, according to this position, Democratic Platform adherents should remain in the party, undertaking further attempts to democratize it from within.

Another portion of movement participants (about 47 percent) believe it is necessary to take their own package of alternative documents to the 28th CPSU Congress and pursue there radical structural reform of the party—with a repudiation of communism as the goal of the CPSU and an appropriate change of the party's name, and with elimination of the single-ideology monopoly, democratic centralism, the territorial-production principle, unitarism, and other totalitarian party principles. If the congress fails to adopt these proposals, they will announce the collective withdrawal of Democratic Platform adherents from the CPSU and the creation of a new party.

Finally, a third portion of movement participants (about three percent) advocates immediate withdrawal from the CPSU.

What the position of the Democratic Platform will be depends a great deal on the composition of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. Although the elections are not yet over, we can already state will every assurance that there will be disproportionately fewer Democratic Platform representatives at the congress than the movement's influence in the CPSU would indicate.

The final position taken by the Democratic Platform will be determined at the second all-Union conference of

movement adherents, to take place in Moscow 16-17 June 1990. Applications have come in and continue to come in from all corners of the country for participation in the conference. Invited to it are 28th CPSU Congress delegates, delegates of republic Communist Party congresses, Democratic Platform adherents, communist leaders of strike committees, leaders of democratic movements...

Information on all questions pertaining to the conference may be obtained at the following address: Room 322, 15 Druzhinnikovskaya Ulitsa, Moscow 123376. Tel: 255-91-15. Conference account: "Otechestvo" Fund, Roskombank, Moscow State University Account No. 161117, USSR State Bank, city of Moscow, MTsO 201791, funding account no. 700724 for "Democratic Platform."

Oblast Conferences on Platform

WA1306190590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Jun 90 p 8

[TASS report: "Party Conferences Are Over"]

[Text] BELGOROD—At an oblast party conference held here, the communists discussed the drafts of the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Party Congress and the party Rules. The delegates came out in favor of reinforcing the unity of the party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and of expanding the rights and powers of primary party organizations. At the same time, numerous remarks and constructive proposals were made regarding the draft CPSU Platform and Rules. A list of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress was confirmed at the conference. Three delegates were elected at the conference. A list of candidates to the central elected organs of the CPSU was also compiled.

VLADIMIR—More than 90,000 communists took part in an extensive discussion of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Rules in the primary party organizations of the oblast. Communists and non-party members made about 2,000 specific proposals and remarks in the course of the meetings and in publications in the mass media. This work was summed up at an oblast party conference. Participants in the conference confirmed a list of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. Three delegates were additionally elected at the conference.

BARNAUL—The Altay Kray party conference, which came to an end, considered the position of an almost 180,000-strong detachment of communists of the Altay for the 28th CPSU Congress and the Russian party conference, as well as specific proposals on the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform and the party Rules. At the conference, candidates to the elected organs of the CPSU and the Russian Communist Party from the party organization of the kray were determined, and a list of 45 delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the Russian Party Conference was confirmed. Five of them were elected on a competitive basis at the conference.

KIROV—The first stage of an oblast party conference came to a close. The communists discussed a report on the work of the CPSU obkom [oblast party committee]. The draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Rules were also discussed. Resolutions on both documents were adopted. The leadership of the oblast party organization will be elected at the second stage of the conference which it was resolved to hold after the forthcoming CPSU congress.

KOSTROMA—A report on the work of the party obkom, the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform, and the new CPSU Rules were discussed at an oblast party conference which closed here. Participants in the conference determined candidates to the elected central organs of the party and held additional elections for delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

V.I. Toropov was reelected first secretary of the Kostroma Obkom by a secret vote.

OREL—The results of the discussion of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th party congress and the CPSU Rules were reviewed at the 25th Oblast Party Conference held here. A report of the oblast electoral commission on the election of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress from the Orel Oblast party organization was heard, and additional elections of two more delegates were held. Proposals on candidates to the elected organs of the CPSU Central Committee were also discussed at the conference.

MOSCOW—The work of the 28th Conference of the Moscow Oblast CPSU organization came to a close. The work of the obkom was discussed, and the results of the discussion of the draft CPSU Platform and Rules were summed up. Additional delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress were elected. The conference adopted an extensive resolution on its agenda.

Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the proceedings of the conferences of Communists of the Moscow area.

KALUGA—V.V. Sudarenkov was elected first secretary of the oblast party organization at the oblast party conference which came to a close here. By a majority vote, participants in the conference confirmed the decision of the CPSU obkom plenum held three months ago which elected him to this position. All the plurality of opinions notwithstanding, no competing candidates were nominated. However, passions flared up seriously in the course of additional elections of members of the party obkom and delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

GORKIY—To determine in a more precise manner their attitude toward those who question the socialist option of the people and have actually placed themselves outside the party on their own by virtue of their views and behavior—such were the instructions given at an oblast party conference to 64 delegates of the 28th CPSU

Congress from the more than 250,000-strong detachment of the communists of Gorkiy. They were instructed to protect the party against the attacks of those who strive to deprive it of its mass support.

Numerous remarks and proposals concerning the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the forthcoming congress and the party Rules were made.

As the results of a questionnaire survey of the conference delegates suggest, 34 percent of them support the Central Committee Platform, 18 percent—the Democratic Platform, and another 10 percent—the Marxist Platform. Forty-six percent think that a split in the party is undesirable. Fifty-six percent of those surveyed approve of the principle of democratic centralism.

KURSK—The voters of Kursk confirmed their confidence in the oblast party organization: They preferred communists at the recent elections of people's deputies at all levels. The principled position of the party obkom, which has been primarily guided by the needs and interests of the working people in its work, was a factor. Many delegates of the 25th Kursk Oblast Report-and-Election Party Conference, which is now over, referred to this. The conference also discussed the course of perestroyka and the tasks of the oblast party organization, the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress, and the draft CPSU Rules, and elected delegates to the forthcoming party congress.

YUZHNO-SAKHALINSK—A way out of the economic crisis in our country lies through a transition to market relations, noted participants in the 21st Sakhalin Oblast party conference held here. However, sharing substantiated objections to a possible sharp decline in the standard of living, the delegates came out in favor of the need to develop and implement effective measures to ensure the social protection of all strata of the population. They proposed to submit this issue for an all-people's discussion, as well as to place it on the agenda of the forthcoming forum of the communists of our country.

The conference summed up the results of the discussion of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform and the CPSU Rules which was held in the party organizations of the oblast and confirmed the results of elections of 10 delegates to the 28th party congress in single-seat and multiple-seat districts. The delegation of representatives of the communists of Sakhalin will arrive in Moscow with a political position developed and adopted by participants in the party conference—a set of proposals on a radical reform of the CPSU.

LENINGRAD—The second stage of proceedings of the joint conference of the Leningrad Oblast and City CPSU organizations ended in Tavricheskiy Palace after two days of the sharpest debate. The conference adopted a political declaration of the communists of Leningrad for the 28th CPSU Congress.

This document absorbed many proposals made by party members with regard to ways to renew the party and overcome the crisis condition of our society. The building of humane democratic socialism, turning the CPSU into the consolidating force of our society in a dramatic period of its perestroyka was proposed as the immediate objective circumscribing a minimal program. The delegates stressed that the confrontation methods of struggle in the course of unavoidable and natural theoretical differences should be abandoned. Main proposals on the draft CPSU Rules were adopted, and the results of analyzing the situation with privileges and preferences in the oblast party organization were discussed. Delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress from the Leningrad party organization were elected to the free seats which remained after elections were held in the rayon and city party organizations.

ARKHANGELSK—Delegates resolved to hold the conference of the Arkhangelsk Oblast party organization in two stages. The communists analyzed critically the work of the party obkom in the period under review and discussed the drafts of the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th party congress and the CPSU Rules. Elections of the first secretary of the Arkhangelsk Oblast CPSU Committee were held on a competitive basis. Yu. Guskov, the previous leader of the oblast party organization, withdrew his candidacy. He was elected chairman of the oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. In a field of four contenders, A. Gromoglasov, general director of the "Arktika" Production Association, was given the support of a majority of delegates to the conference as a result of secret voting.

Oblast Leaders Among Delegates

PM0606122790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Elected to the Party Congress. CPSU Organizations Continue to Elect Delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] Kuybyshev—The delegates elected by the oblast's communists to the party congress include a large group of rural representatives. They include V.S. Shevyakov, first secretary of Krasnoyarskiy Raykom [rayon party committee].

"If the party's prestige is strong anywhere, it is in the depths of the countryside," V.S. Shevyakov, said. "A communist's word still carries weight and force."

Irkutsk—The oblast party conference summed up the results of the elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. The following obtained seats: V.I. Potapov, first secretary of the obkom [oblast party committee]; V.K. Chekalov, commander of a Tu-154 crew at the Irkutsk aviation enterprise; V.P. Sapachev, driver of an electric locomotive at the Irkutsk-Sortirovochnyy Depot, and others.

Lvov—The delegates whom the communists are sending to the congress include N.F. Naychuk, party and Great Patriotic War veteran; V.V. Sekretaryuk, first secretary

of the CPSU obkom; and V.A. Rybynok, general director of the "Elektron" Science-and-Production Association.

Kirov—A large group of communists will go to Moscow from here for the 28th CPSU Congress. The include V.A. Desyatnikov, chairman of the Kirov Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies,

'New Approaches' to Congress

PM2905142990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 90 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report under the "Discussion Pamphlet" rubric: "Appeal from Delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the 27th Moscow City CPSU Organization Conference Who Are Participants in the Moscow Delegates Club"]

[Text] There is little time left before the start of the 28th CPSU Congress. In our view an alarming situation has taken shape in connection with the lack of coordination between the actions of the CPSU Central Committee and the body of deputies to elaborate the drafts of the congress' main documents. This will inevitably upset the businesslike working of the congress and give rise to futile debate.

The extraordinary nature of the impending forum dictates new approaches to Communists' participation in shaping precongress documents.

In connection with this we propose:

1. That an all-Union club of 28th CPSU Congress Delegates be created with regional deputies' clubs in the localities and a single coordinating center.

2. That members of the CPSU Central Committee commission preparing the draft congress documents be assigned to the club's coordinating center to organize joint work. That it be recommended that the composition of the Central Committee commission be expanded to include members of the deputies' club.

3. That a discussion of the draft documents prepared by the CPSU Central Committee commission for the congress be held at the all-Union club of 28th CPSU Congress Delegates.

That their advance publication be deemed advisable in order for all Communists to study them extensively.

4. That pages in PRAVDA and other party publications be provided for the regular publication of comments and proposals by the All-Union Club relating to the draft precongress documents.

Revenko Address Newsmen on Federation Structure

LD1506120490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 15 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The renewal of the foundations of the Soviet federation was the subject of a meeting between Grigoriy Ivanovich Revenko, member of the Presidential Council, with journalists in Moscow at the press center of the 28th CPSU congress and the Russian party conference.

[Correspondent I. Minayev, identified by caption] The problem of a national state structure is in the forefront today. The need to urgently embark on working out a new union treaty which guarantees the true sovereignty of republics is clear. A union of equal socialist states, Comrade Revenko pointed out, needs to be shaped by taking into consideration the particular characteristics of each republic, with the priorities in the process being put on the rights and freedoms of the individual, for at the present time about 60 million Soviet citizens live outside the territory of their national formations. Comrade Revenko focussed special attention to the correlation of the rights of the union republics. In his opinion a minimum of priorities should be placed on the center. They could be constitutional principles, questions of human rights, the protection of borders and defense, and a section of international relations.

Among the numerous questions asked at the meeting was this: have any new approaches been put forward in tackling the Baltic knot of problems? Replying to this, Comrade Revenko said, in part:

[Begin Revenko recording] Landsbergis was told bluntly: Let's solve the question this way. You establish a moratorium, so as not to undermine your policy, on your decision adopted on 11 March, and we at this moment will tackle questions on these sanctions which exist, because these sanctions existed as one of the fundamental issues. In my opinion, it has been taken in, and some kind of small progress has begun. And I belive good will and political prudence are needed from both one side and the other. [end recording]

Reportage on Peasants Congress Continues

Ligachev Criticizes Gorbachev

AU1506125390 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1000 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Christian Schueller report]

[Excerpt] Yegor Ligachev, spokesman of the conservatives, has now blown his top. He will not permit the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Ligachev cried at the congress of the sovkhoz and kolkhoz directors. The country's leadership, that is, Gorbachev, is far too permissive. All the warnings that he has addressed to the Kremlin leader were flung to the winds, he said.

Such bellicosity has not been heard from Gorbachev's most powerful opponent for a long time. Soviet television management, with its pronounced sensitiveness for the hierarchy, reported neither Ligachev's speech nor the appearance of Gorbachev's second great rival, Boris

Yeltsin, who took the floor shortly before Ligachev with a completely contrary program.

Both fighting cocks drew bursts of applause from the delegates to the agricultural conference. Apparently, the kolkhozes and sovkohzes are not yet certain which side will ultimately gain the upper hand at the top. [passage omitted]

Peasants Congress Ends

LD1406101190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1718 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 13 Jun (TASS)—The charter of the USSR Peasants Union was adopted at the country's inagural Peasants Congress which was concluded here today. The Peasants Union, the charter states, is a sociopolitical organization. A most important objective of the union is the creation of a mass public movement for radical socioeconomic changes in agriculture and providing for its priority nature, the social reorganization of the countryside, the spiritual regeneration of the peasantry, and an improvement in the conditions of the life and work of those engaged in the agro-industrial complex.

[Words indistinct] for the post of chairman of the union, including Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. But all the candidates have refused to accept nomination. The delegates persuaded one candidate, Vasiliy Starodubtsev, chairman of the Russian Agrarian Union, to run for this post. He was elected chairman of the USSR Peasants Union by an overwhelming majority.

Setting out his manifesto, the peasants leader stressed devotion to collective forms of agricultural production which, in his belief, have by no means realized their own potential. At the same time he stated that he understands and respects other forms of economic management.

Chernobyl Union To Hold Congress 15-17 Jun

Purpose Viewed

LD1406133690 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksey Petrunya and Andrey Chirva]

[Text] Kiev June 14 TASS—The main purpose of the volutnary USSR Chrnobyl Union is to defend the interests of people who took part in Chernobyl clear-up efforts in 1986, as well as of their families and victims of the catastrophe. It will begin its first congress here on Friday [15 June].

Chairman of the union's board Georgiy Lepin told TASS that it was set up in October 1989. "About 600,000 servicemen and civilians were involved in the liquidation of Chernobyl consequences. Many more people live in contaminated territories," he noted.

Five million hectares of land are contaminated by radionuclids in the Ukraine alone. Some 60,000 people live in the so-called rigorously controlled zone. The disaster's consequences have spread to several regions of Belorussia and the Russian Federation."

"Th state," Lepin stressed, "is assisting the victims of the disaster. Several government decisions have been passed recently to this effect, in addition to the decree of the USSR president. The Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR has approved a comprehensive programme to liquidate the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster and to aid victims."

Lepin believes, however, that far from everything has been done so far. Many Chernobyl victims are socially unprotected and lack proper care from local authorities.

The Chernobyl union plans to help them all. The union is in constant contact with the Soviet and republican governments, as well as with the local authorities. The best polyclinics and hospitals have been placed at the disposal of those who helped combat the consequences of the disaster. They are being treated at the USSR Medical Radiology Center and the Kiev City Diagnostic Center.

The congress will discuss problems linked with clear-up efforts, adopt the society's charter, a "code of honour" of its members and an appeal to the Soviet Government and to world public opinion.

The congress will end on June 17.

Congress Opens

LD1506102190 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Alexey Petrunya and Andrey Chirva]

[Text] Kiev June 15 TASS—"Humaneness and benevolence" is the motto of the Chernobyl Union, an all-Union public organisation, the first congress of which opened in the Ukrainian capital today.

One of the main purposes of the union is to protect the interests of participants in the Chernobyl accident clean-up operations, their families and all people who suffered as a result of the disaster, since state assistance is not effective enough.

Delegates to the three-day congress, who represent many regions of the country, will discuss problems connected with the elimination of the consequences of the breakdown at the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

They will adopt the union's statute, a code of honour for its members, the status of Chernobyl people, and appeals to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Soviet government and the international public, and will elect the leading bodies of the Chernobyl union.

AUCCTU Reviews Chernobyl Aid

WA1306185190 Moscow TRUD in Russian 6 Jun 90 p 1

[Article by unidentified TRUD correspondent: "The AUCCTU: We Will Help Chernobyl"]

[Text] A working meeting on the issue of trade union participation in the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station chaired by Comrade G.I. Yanayev has been held at the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions].

It was noted that many justified complaints about the course of the entirety of such work by central and local organs of power and trade union organizations are being voiced at meetings with labor collectives and in letters and telegrams to the AUCCTU. The shortage of medical cadres, the medicines and equipment needed, vitamin-fortified foodstuffs, and mineral water is acutely felt in the affected regions. There are many shortcomings in the organization of recreation and treatment of people who suffered due to the accident at the nuclear power station.

It was envisaged especially to review at an AUCCTU plenum the issues of participation by our country's trade unions in solving the entire set of problems associated with eliminating the consequences of the accident at the nuclear power station. It was also resolved that the AUCCTU, in cooperation with the central committees of trade unions and trade union organizations of territories adjacent to the Chernobyl zone will work out a unified program of practical actions aimed at improving the health status of the populace, and children in particular, who currently reside in regions with a harsh radioactive background. It is meant to set forth measures aimed at developing and augmenting in a planned manner the material facilities needed to this end, including the pertinent specialization of resorts, travel hostels, and pioneer camps and the construction of new recreation and treatment facilities.

Miners' Congress Slates Government Performance

PM1406135190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent N. Lisovenko report: "Miners Criticize Government"]

[Text] Donetsk—The second day of work of the miner's congress was remarkable for its particular sharpness—the question of the mine workers' social position was discussed.

This sharpness was predetermined to a significant degree by two circumstances: A speech by USSR People's Deputy Nikolay Travkin, who stated that the CPSU had not fulfilled a single one of its promises to the people, and an accident in the A.F. Zasyadko pit in which five miners died and three were injured as a result of a methane gas explosion. Participants of the miners' forum resolved to set up their own congress commission to clarify all the circumstances of the tragic event.

The miners' speeches again raised questions of the low level of social protection and the disastrous state of cities and settlements.

The congress of the country's miners adopted an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet and to the country's working people which voiced dissatisfaction with the USSR Government. In the opinion of the congress the government has not coped with the task of leading the country out of the crisis, and the measures it has adopted are not improving the life of the people and are not radically altering the existing socioeconomic situation in the country.

"We call on the USSR Supreme Soviet to consider the opinion of all strata of the population and all the country's democratic parties and movements when it forms a new government," the appeal says.

A day of mourning was declared for 14 June in Donetsk, when the bodies of the miners who were killed will be committed to the earth. The congress is continuing its work.

Self-Determination Urged for All Nationalities

PM1406084390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by A. Khanbabyan, post-graduate student of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, under the rubric "The Nationalities Question": "The Strength of Friendship Lies in Equality of Rights"]

[Text] Moscow—For a long time it was customary to think that in conditions of socialism the peoples' right to self-determination loses its practical relevance because socialism by itself guarantees their free development. Practice has shown, however, that nothing in life happens of its own accord: There must be real mechanisms which enable theoretical postulates to be put into practice.

This was obvious to Lenin: "...When it is said that under socialism self-determination is superfluous, that is as nonsensical and as utterly idiotic as saying that under socialism democracy is superfluous."

Incidentally, is the fact that until very recently all talk about national self-determination was called sedition and the nationalities question was considered settled once and for all not the reason why democracy in our country was in such a bad way?

I think that simply raising the question of self-determination again has caused doubts, to put it mildly, about "ideological firmness," because this was unambiguously taken as a disguised striving for secession, the destruction of the Union, and so forth. However, the concept of self-determination is far broader. As Yu. Barsegov rightly said, it "presupposes the possibility of

leaving, the possibility of joining, and the possibility of living autonomously" (see: Discussion Page for 12 May 1990).

In this connection one is bound to note that the present Constitution places our country's peoples in intentionally unequal conditions. What happens is that the union republics have extensive opportunities for self-determination, up to and including the right to withdraw from the Union, whereas the peoples living in the autonomous republics and autonomous formations not only lack such rights but cannot even autonomously resolve far more innocent questions, such as which republic to belong to and indeed whether to belong to one at all or to live under open and direct central administration. Such a position, which is a very far cry from basic justice, is a consequence of the fact that our Union is built not so much according to Lenin's plans as in accordance with Stalin's infamous autonomization plan, gradually put into practice. It is my profound conviction that this is one of the main reasons for the present deterioration in interethnic relations.

There is no doubt that any people, irrespective of numerical size or the area of the territory they occupy, must have the opportunity to independently decide their own fate. In so doing, of course, the rights of citizens who either live outside their own national formations or do not have such formations must not suffer in any way.

The first steps in this direction have already been taken by our legislators. But what should the actual mechanism for realizing the right to self-determination of autonomous units at all levels be like? I think that in the first stage of its elaboration certain principles could be used which were enshrined in the recently adopted law on the procedure for the secession of a union republic from the USSR: the holding of referendums, the establishment of a certain transitional period, the introduction of a system of compensation for a union republic if this or that autonomous unit wishes to leave it, guarantees for the rights of the nonindigenous population, and so forth.

I believe that such an approach, together with the gradual development of an all-union market with its potential for integration, will make it possible to preserve the unity of our federation, give it new content, and provide a fitting response to the stern challenge of history. But in the long term, clearly, we will have to completely abandon the principle whereby one people can enjoy greater rights than another.

In a renewed federation, all peoples without exception and, thus, the people belonging to them must enjoy absolutely identical rights and opportunities. And it should not be thought that the renunciation of outmoded dogmas and conventional and rigid administrative schemes can somehow weaken the Union undergoing renewal. On the contrary, the elimination of hierarchical structures in the interethnic sphere can only strengthen it. After all, the main strength of our state lies in the friendship of the Soviet peoples. And real, sincere friendship is possible only between equals.

Ministry Describes Interethnic 'Chronicle of War'

PM1506094990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 4

["After The Briefing" report by Lieutenant Colonel S. Kalinayev: "For Law And Order"]

[Text] Nearly every day we learn from media reports of new instances of mass disturbances, arson, the killing of perfectly innocent people, and the total or partial destabilization of the situation as a result of the exacerbation of interethnic relations. Again, in conditions of wide-scale criminal manifestations, USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD] internal troops have to intervene.

At yesterday's routine briefing at the USSR MVD journalists were acquainted with a chronicle of events that was, to be frank, alarming, like a chronicle of war. Over a period of more than two years, starting with the events in Sumgait, to be precise, internal troops subunits have been used in 13 regions with a difficult operational situation, on two to three occasions in some of them (Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, Baku, and the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic). In the course of the assignments around 24,000 people were arrested for various crimes and offenses and more than 4,000 firearms, over 73,000 rounds of ammunition, and around 500 explosive devices were seized.

Alas, personnel were forced to use weapons hundreds of times in extreme situations. All these instances are deemed to have been legitimate.

It is with great pain and bewilderment that we talk today about losses among internal forces' personnel—after all, it is not war! During clashes with armed extremists 10 enlisted men and NCO's, one cadet, and four officers were killed, around 100 servicemen were seriously hurt, and more than 1,000 sustained minor injuries. Four are missing.

The exacerbation of the sociopolitical situation in the country demanded more efficient legal regulation of the forces' activity. A "Law on the Duties and Rights of USSR Internal Affairs Ministry Internal Forces when Protecting Public Order" was adopted to this end. It reflected some fundamentally new elements. In particular—the legal status of the forces in connection with their separation from the USSR Armed Forces. The internal troops are meant today to be a powerful mobile public security force, which is brought in to put a stop to antisocial actions by a decision of the internal affairs minister at the request of the union or autonomous republic council of ministers or in execution of a USSR presidential decree.

The Law "On the Legal Framework of a State of Emergency," which was brought into force in April, has the most direct bearing on the internal troops—something

that was also mentioned at the briefing. It stipulates that troop units of the Armed Forces and the KGB can be used as well as internal troops, in exceptional cases, to eliminate the aftermath of emergency situations, protect public order, and safeguard security. A joint operational staff from the three departments can be set up to coordinate their actions.

The men with the shoulder boards—a real force for the stabilization of the situation in the country—stand side by side, protecting citizens' lives, and move into action when exceptional measures are needed to neutralize criminals or criminal groupings.

Academician Discusses Removing Ethnic Tension

90US0987A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 29 May 90 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Academician Yu. Bromley, chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Council for Interethnic Relations, by S. Brusin; date and place not specified: "There Is No Such Thing as Small Peoples"]

[Text] *Academician Yu. Bromley, chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Council for Interethnic Relations, reflects on ways to eliminate the ethnic tension in our country.*

[Brusin] Let us get to the point right away: How is the ethnic tension which has emerged in our country to be eliminated?

[Bromley] I will give a simple answer: Genuine equality of rights of the peoples needs to be ensured. This is the fundamental principle of a civilized nationalities policy.

[Brusin] However, we have been trying for more than 70 years to do this.

[Bromley] Since equal rights are at issue, we should resolutely bring to an end all manifestations both of discrimination and of obtaining privileges by virtue of ethnicity.

[Brusin] We should, we must... However, in reality everything is different, as a rule. So, recently a law was adopted on increasing penalties for infringing on the equal ethnic rights of citizens and forcibly violating the territorial integrity of the USSR. Will it be able to extinguish, to some degree, the hotbeds of interethnic conflict?

[Bromley] The law is quite timely, especially because it affects not only individual citizens but also organizations of a nationalist nature. However, a lot of time has already passed since it was adopted, but still has the impression that this law does not exist. Meanwhile, clearly unlawful activities by a number of citizens' associations are apparent, including mass movements, which are aimed at inciting national enmity and strife and the actual violation of the territorial integrity of the Union.

[Brusin] How are the equal rights of the peoples to be ensured in practice?

[Bromley] First of all, it is necessary to take into account the ethnic culture of a particular ethnic community, including its language and its ethnic self-awareness. I perceive the meeting and development of these natural needs of all peoples as the most significant prerequisite for eliminating tension in the sphere of ethnic relations. The creation of ethnic cultural and language centers, regional fraternities, and associations at all levels, including the all-union level, plays a special role. In the course of it, we should remember that no people possessing its own inimitable culture can be small, as they sometimes imprudently "title" it in the press. It may only be small as far as numbers are concerned.

One of the most complex problems from the point of view of social justice emerges in this matter. The inequality indicated means someone's privileges and someone's difficulties. Ideally, they should be divided evenly, as happens in a large and close family, and some nonnumerous peoples should be brought up to the level of those "advanced." However, who is to be considered advanced? Besides, is such a classification proper in the case of unique entities, which is what the peoples are? I would very much like to avoid reducing this to a primitive leveling approach to various territorial population groups, distinguishing, as was the case before, the leading role of "the elder brother." On the other hand, a situation is hardly fair when, say, the people who live in an area where oil resources have been found feel that they are superior to others.

[Brusin] However, what is to be done about the principle of national self-determination in this case?

[Bromley] First of all, I cannot fail to recall that this principle cannot be reduced to the right to secede, as it has been increasingly often interpreted recently. It is no accident that, with minor exceptions (primarily the USSR), the constitutions of an overwhelming majority of the countries of the world do not recognize the right to secede, despite many international documents repeatedly stressing the significance of the principle of national self-determination. Also, the implementation of the right to secede is practically possible for far from all the nationalities residing here, in our country. In other words, there is clearly no equal opportunity in this regard. The essence of national self-determination under modern conditions is different: It primarily includes ensuring free ethno-cultural reproduction and development and, therefore, the preservation of nationalities as such.

[Brusin] However, this unavoidably leads to striving to create better conditions for "your own" nationality.

[Bromley] Indeed, it is so. However, this striving should not infringe upon the interests of others. Circumspection is necessary in everything. However, it is particularly necessary when economic and political levers are used to

protect the interests of individual nationalities. In particular, it is absolutely impermissible to introduce economic privileges of some kind on the basis of ethnicity.

At first sight, it may appear obvious that the interests of nationalities are going to be served best by their states, by every nationality having its own state. However, history meant it otherwise. At present, more than 3,000 peoples populating our planet live in fewer than 200 states, most of which are polyethnic. All attempts to make these two numbers "correspond" would be fraught with interethnic and interstate conflicts of a catastrophic nature.

Meanwhile, peace and calm in a state are quite possible if the administrative-territorial division runs sort of "against the grain" of the national structure. This situation is characteristic of many developing countries. It is also encountered in developed countries, for example, in Switzerland and France. Self-governing associations at different levels assume responsibility for meeting the specific cultural needs of individual nationalities. Administrative-territorial authorities of all ranks are called upon to give them support.

In the United States, national entities are mainly limited to local ethnic communities. In Hungary, an overwhelming majority of them belong to unions of a national scope, and all of these unions do not just take care of teaching their native languages in schools, creating ethnic literature, and developing their traditional culture, but also have their representatives in the parliament. There also are other variants. One of them is a "mixed" federation which combines national-territorial autonomous entities with usual territorial-administrative units. This is, for example, the PRC, Spain, Belgium, and Canada. "A union" is another type of federation. Such a state is a set of main (union) national-territorial units within which other national-territorial and oblast units may exist. This type is expressed most clearly in the USSR and to a considerable degree in the SFRY.

[Brusin] Which type of state structure do you prefer?

[Bromley] I would not venture a judgment on the whole. Let me only observe that at present ethnic conflicts are the fewest in the "against-the-grain" version (the case of Switzerland is particularly instructive), and ethnic relations are inflamed the most in the "union" type of federation.

[Brusin] Why was this last variant opted for in our country?

[Bromley] This has developed historically. It is known that initially V.I. Lenin was the proponent of a unitary state. When the issue of combining the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat with the national-liberation movement arose, Lenin and the party changed their attitude toward the federation. However, initially a federation of the mixed type was meant. In the process, as the 1918 RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitution, which was meant for the entire territory of the former Russia, noted, national autonomous entities were created in regions which "stood out for a special mode of life and ethnic composition." This was done in order to create favorable conditions for the socio-cultural advancement of these regions, primarily by training indigenous cadres. However, the danger of the disintegration of Russia as a result of the German occupation, counterrevolution, and foreign intervention became apparent. The appearance of bourgeois "governments" on its territory in the Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia also became a factor. At the same time, by the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919, the Ukrainian Soviet Republic was restored and the Estonian, Belorussian, and Latvian Soviet Republics were formed anew, along with the RSFSR and with the aid of the latter. In 1920 and the beginning of 1921, such republics were created in Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Georgia. However, these were independent state and political formations. Under the circumstances, Lenin began to think about creating their federative association, the Union of Soviet Republics. This idea of Lenin's was specifically implemented in 1922. In conjunction with this, they usually refer to one of the last documents of Lenin—his notes "On the Issue of Nationalities and Autonomization." However, in reality everything was not that simple. A letter from Lenin to L.B. Kamenev and members of the RKP(b) [Russian Communist Party—Bolsheviks] Central Committee Politburo written in late September 1922 testifies to this convincingly. In this letter, Lenin noted that Stalin had already agreed to make one amendment in a draft resolution on this issue: "...instead of saying 'joining the RSFSR,' to say 'formal unification with the RSFSR into the Union of Republics of Europe and Asia.'"

Evaluating this step, Lenin immediately observed: "I hope that the spirit of this concession is understandable: We acknowledge ourselves to be the equals of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and so on." Explaining the sense of this concession further, he wrote: "It is important for us not to give ammunition to 'the independence-minded,' not to destroy their independence, but to create yet another new level, a federation of republics endowed with equal rights." In other words, Lenin clearly proceeded from tactical considerations.

As far as further prospects for the development of the Union are concerned, Lenin made quite definitive statements on this issue repeatedly, describing the federation as a transitional form "toward the full unity of workers of various nationalities."

[Brusin] To your mind, what is important now from the "tactical point of view?"

[Bromley] At present, it is inadvisable to change the administrative-territorial structure of the country at any of its levels by redrawing borders between the republics and inside them. We should freeze this structure until ethnic passions subside while at the same time reducing

the significance of boundaries between the republics. In this matter, the issue of the economic independence of the republics is important.

I agree with S.S. Shatalin who considers the very idea of regional economic accountability dubious and, certainly, that variety of it which is based on ethnic attributes. It is instructive that even the first steps in this direction are accompanied by decisions such as the introduction of republic means of payment, adoption of immigration laws, and bans on shipping out products made above the plan.... The ambition unavoidably appears to produce everything locally, to make the economy of territories self-contained. In turn, economic isolation means a loss to the all-union market of wholesale goods and the destruction of the already existing system of the interrepublic division of labor. Only the rapid development of market relations in the economy may counteract these pernicious tendencies. However, they are, alas, merely proclaimed in our economy, whereas centrifugal tendencies are rapidly developing right now.

[Brusin] What is necessary in order to overcome this tendency?

[Bromley] As far as the economy is concerned, the creation of an all-union market which meets the needs and serves the interests of all peoples of the country, all of its regions, is called upon to play a key role in unifying the republics. As I see it, the regions themselves should maintain the historically developed economic ties. The following regions have taken shape: the Northwest, the Far East, the Baltic area, Central Asia, Siberia, the Urals, the Center, North Caucasus, Transcaucasia, and others. Incidentally, it would be worthwhile to study both the favorable and unfavorable experience of creating the sovnarkhozes [councils of the national economy]. Before it is too late, we should also take into account the experience of the SFRY which has shown graphically that economic decentralization along republic lines promotes the growth of centrifugal forces and development of republic separatism disguised in the struggle for sovereignty, and ultimately brings about interethnic conflicts.

Noting the significance of the ethnic composition of the populace for economics, Lenin at the same time noted that this factor "is neither the only one nor the most significant one" for economics. Indeed, the ethnocultural aspects of ethnic phenomena are mainly associated with the people, that is, the ethnic composition of the populace, whereas economic aspects are associated with the territory and, primarily, its resources.

[Brusin] What is important to ensure in the political and legal sphere?

[Bromley] It is necessary to comply with the principle of equal rights in the very representation of the nationalities in the state organs. From this point of view, our situation is, unfortunately, far from ideal. For example, only 52 nationalities are represented in the composition of the Soviet of Nationalities of the current USSR Supreme Soviet, out of almost 130 populating our country. This means that we are looking at a Soviet of Republics rather than a Soviet of Nationalities. This is a graphic example of political and legal inequality of the union-republic and other nationalities of the country. This is why I think that ethnic-cultural associations should have representatives in the organs of power at all levels (up to the USSR Supreme Soviet).

At the same time, we should see that the differences between nationalities which develop naturally are "complemented" by deliberately established privileges or discriminatory measures. Thus, in a number of cases the introduction of state languages was used to set the titular nationalities of the republics against all others within the republics. Moreover, as is known, the introduction of state languages in individual republics is accompanied by the language discrimination against the so-called non-indigenous nationalities. Specifically, I will recall that the Estonian SSR Language Law establishes a period of one year for the conversion of clerical work to Estonian in Tallinn, where the bulk of workers are Russian speakers. Ethnic discrimination offends individuals with particular gravity and appears insulting to them—hence the pronounced outbursts of emotions. This is exactly why Lenin repeatedly noted the need not only to observe formal equality but also to make up for "the inequality which has actually developed in life by the oppressing, large nation."

The laws on language and on nationalities residing outside their republics, or those which do not have their republics, which were recently adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet provide quite favorable prerequisites for ensuring equal ethnic rights. It is important for these laws to begin applying, especially if the laws adopted earlier run counter to them.

[Brusin] Recently, the autonomous republics accomplished a far-reaching "constitutional breakthrough": They ensured that autonomous republics were classified as subjects of the federation, along with the union republics, in the law on the delineation of powers between the USSR and the subjects of the federation. How will this affect the signing of the union treaty?

[Bromley] Certainly, having taken the first step, we cannot but take the next one. However, I doubt the legitimacy of signing such a treaty in the first place. After all, the republics have already delegated their powers to the Union, and indefinitely at that. Therefore, only the refinement and renewal of the treaty by the subjects of the federation may be at issue. Our union state has existed for decades now. It is not a baby but a developed organism which is bound by millions of most varied threads. A new birth of this organism is pure nonsense—certainly, if we mean a federative state rather than a confederation of states, because this is something different. As I have already noted in the press, the transformation of our union state into a confederation of independent states would be a clearly regressive step because at present the entire world is moving toward integration

rather than disintegration. This would make the entire process of perestroyka extremely complicated by destroying existing ties and making the creation of a developed market quite difficult. The main point is that this would reduce our motherland to the level of a third-rate country.

A system of mutual relations between the Union and the republics under which they will have different rights and duties also appears to be unfair. As was justifiably noted in the Supreme Soviet, in this case some of the republics will come to be privileged. Indeed, some will, for example, shoulder the entire load of defense concerns; others will use the results without making an effort. Other subjects of the federation will hardly agree to this.

[Brusin] In this context, what is your view of the position of the RSFSR?

[Bromley] I believe that it will hardly agree to the unequal status of republics. Its Cinderella status should come to an end. It is no accident that at the Congress of People's Deputies of this republic the issue of its sovereignty has just been placed on the agenda with particular unanimity. To be sure, in the course of resolving it they should be mindful of the fact that Russia is the backbone of the Union, and that there is no such thing as absolute sovereignty, especially in a union state.

Listening to speeches at the congress, one may get the impression that the Law on the Delineation of Powers Between the Union and the Subjects of the Federation which was recently adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet does not exist at all. This is why it appears important not to stop at the declaration of general principles of mutual relations between Russia and the Union. Specific steps for setting forth in legislation the real powers of the republic authorities are necessary. The principle of equal rights also calls for the individual regions of Russia, whose potential frequently exceeds that of some republics, to have contributions to their socio-cultural infrastructure which are no lower. This is extremely necessary for the normal reproduction of the Russian ethnic entity.

At the same time, we should keep in mind the fact that more than 20 million Russians live outside the RSFSR (this is more than the combined population of five union republics—Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Moldavia) who in practice do not always enjoy equal rights. Russia should be more concerned about them.

[Brusin] What is your vision of a strategic path toward establishing stable interethnic accord in the country in the future?

[Bromley] Many factors should play an important role in this matter and, of course, economic reform is not the least of them. As a result of it, we should expect, among other things, a rapid increase in mutual interest in businesslike cooperation on the part of various nationalities and various regions of the country. The center of gravity in the "management" of national life should be gradually shifted increasingly toward national-cultural associations of all kinds. The creation of a far-flung network of such entities is called upon to become the most significant step in the development of the genuine sovereignty of nationalities, in restructuring the organizational forms of their existence. As I see it, this is exactly the main path toward depoliticizing ethnic relations in our country. It goes without saying that the organs of power at all levels (primarily the soviets) should provide all types of assistance to the national associations.

To be sure, this model will have to be made more specific and precise. All steps in this direction should be comprehensively thought-through and balanced. After all, only the consistent implementation of genuine equal rights is capable of eliminating the interethnic tension which flares up in ethnic conflicts here and there. We should be aware of the fact that national egoism multiplied by extremism is fraught with regular fascism.

Professional Internal Troops Unit Operational

PM1406122590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 Second Edition p 8

[A. Urvantsev article under the rubric "At the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs": "First 'Pros'"]

[Text] The first professional subunit has been set up within the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops. Soldiers who had completed their draft signed a two-year contract with the command. This was reported at a briefing yesterday for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR MVD.

Major General A. Grivenko, chief of the Internal Troops Political Directorate, commented on this fact:

"A comprehensive program is under development to gradually switch significant numbers of internal troops, on a purely voluntary basis, to paid service under contract. We are still just experimenting at the Dzerzhinskiy Division. The professionals live in barracks and undergo intensive special training. Pay for enlisted men and NCO's ranges between 300 and 330 rubles a month."

Just what motivates guys to make this choice in their careers?

"We didn't sign the contract for the money," V. Ovchar, private first class in a professional subunit, said. "During my draft service I served at many so-called hotspots where there were conflicts on interethnic grounds. It's hard taking about it, but I saw burned corpses of small children and women with my own eyes. My guys and I cannot be complacent about this. Our duty is to prevent disaster and stop it affecting people in their homes."

The work is indeed dangerous. The following facts were cited at the briefing: In classes with armed extremists internal troops had suffered losses while protecting people. They had come under fire from all kinds of weapons, had home-made explosives and grenades

thrown at them, been taken hostage, and had rocks thrown at them. Over the past two years 10 enlisted men and NCO's, one cadet, and four officers have been killed and four servicemen have been lost without trace. Some 2,056 enlisted men, NCO's, warrant officers, and officers have been awarded orders and medals for courage and decisive action displayed in the course of their duties.

At the briefing journalists were familiarized with the new legal documents which regulate actions by internal troops in emergency situations.

Religiously Motivated Draft Dodging Examined

PM0706153290 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 22, 10-17 Jun 90 p 15

[Dmitriy Radyshevskiy article: "The Sixth Commandment"]

[Text] In 1989, 6,647 young men refused to be drafted in the Soviet Army, six times more than the year before. Another draft is on now. The number of conscientious objectors threatens to grow even more. How should the as yet unpublished draft law on alternative service address this problem?

To begin with, the draft ought to comply with international norms.

First. Alternative service ought to be civilian in nature, that is to say, it should be performed in public institutions outside the control of military authorities.

In 1977, 160 draftees-Pentecostalists in the Rovno Region (the Ukraine) refused to take the oath. Christ's Sixth Commandment, "You shall not commit murder", forbade them, as well as Baptists, Seventh-Day Adventists, and followers of some other Protestant communities to take up arms. Since then the followers of those denominations have been mostly sent to serve in military construction units-which cannot be regarded as alternative service because, first, there is no separate law regulating this work and the recruit's lot is left in the hands of the call-up commission. Second, "building battalions" are subordinated to military authorities.

Second. The duration of alternative service shall not be punitive, that is longer than regular military service.

When the Committee for Defence Matters of the USSR Supreme Soviet discussed the issue, proposals were made to institute four- to five-year service in hospitals, rescue teams, and even in the clean-up operations connected with the Chernobyl accident.

Third. "The right to conscientious objection to military service shall be recognized" (Resolution No. 173 of the UN Human Rights Committee).

Last year, almost 6,000 conscientious objectors refused to perform military service for political reasons. They were for the most part draftees from the Baltic Republics, the Transcaucasia and the Central Asian Republics.

Political problems will be resolved, sooner or later, as will be the problems of setting up adequately qualified commissions at the recruiting officers to acertain the religious persuasions entitling draftees to conscientious objection. Hasty decisions are inadmissible here. But regardless of how soon the law on alternative service is adopted, the following problem ought to be resolved immediately, because it belies all official denials that there are prisoners of conscience in the USSR.

Twice a year, during seasonal drafts in the Soviet army, the militia encircles the houses of Jehovah's Witnesses in the Western Ukraine. "Taking refuseniks under arrest," the local people say. They do not mean the people denied emigration, but the young men whose faith prohibits any association with "secular authorities".

Young Witnesses refuse to serve in the army and thus deliberately doom themselves to three years in prison. When released, they are subject to another draft-and upon refusal are sent to penitentiary again, this time, as recidivists, for five years! If released earlier, under amnesty, they may be sent to prison again, on the same charge!

It appears that in order to get round the international legal norms and to repeatedly punish one and the same person for the same "crime", Article 72 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code is formulated so as to punish "avoiding the seasonal draft" instead of refusal to perform military duty. There is an ideological explanation for this: "Punishment ought to be designed to reform and improve the offender's character". Which means that after the penitentiary, a believer ought to stop believing!

The problem of Jehovah's Witnesses is international. In the coutnries maintaining professional armies, the law releases the Witnesses from military service even in time of war. To resolve the problem democratically, however, we do not even have to imitate somebody else's experience. We should simply recall our own. The Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the Russian Federation, signed by Lenin on January 4, 1919, released from military service the persons whose "religious persuasions do not permit them to take up arms"....

V. Dobynda, T. Kuusk, V. Osipov, M. Drayunchok, P. Petrenko, Yu. Kaptala, L. Pulikovskiy, E. Churi, and V. Shust are Jehovah's Witnesses from the Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Estonia who are currently serving additional sentences for refusing to perform military service. 40 more conscientious objectors are in prison for the first time. The list is not complete. It was compiled by the Moscow activists of the Transnational Radical Party who are campaigining for the release of imprisoned pacifists. They have also submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet their own draft law on alternative service. Conscientious objectors themselves do not turn to newspapers or public organizations. They put their faith in God....

'Unlawful Discharge' From Army Examined

PM0606165090 London MOSCOW NEWS in English No 1, 1-7 Jun 90 p 15

[Vladimir Kiselev article: "Sacked—Officer Who Refused To Follow His Orders Blindly"]

[Text] The case of Major Viktor Trofimov's unlawful discharge from the Armed Forces has been taken up by People's Deputy Professor Isakov, who has submitted a request for an inquiry to Mikhail Gorbachev as Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The major was abrupty discharged from the Army for refusing to carry out orders which he considered mindless, despite having only two years to go until his retirement.

He was fired under Article 61 of the Statute on the Performance of Military Duty for Allegedly discrediting the lofty name of a Soviet officer. He had at least 47 references of support but it didn't help.

Trofimov had given his life and health to the Army and is now being thrown out into the street without a pension, retirement benefits or a pay-off.

When summoned before the board of senior officers, convened specially to decide his fate, he said: "Comrades, sooner or later each of us will have to make his choice. Today it is criminal to be a thoughtless executive. Personally, I do not rule out the possibility that tomorrow we shall be taken to the city squares to fight our own people..."

The major's words proved prophetic. He had been ordered to prepare for the possibility of trouble in Baku as a meeting in support of perestroika was about to take place there.

Trofimov knew that a public meeting in Tbilisi in 1956 had ended in bloodshed with countless women and children killed in the streets by the Army despite the fact that a non-specific order had been given to the commander in charge.

The major forsaw a repeat of this horrific incident and took steps to prevent it happening by simply refusing to go ahead and lead the Army. The most important thing was the order was not official therefore technically he was not disobeying his superiors.

On that very day the military unit was ready for action. The officers had been ordered into the barracks and told to be ready to issue blank and live catridges to their men.

They were also ordered to prepare the combat equipment for immediate departure and keep vehicles at the gates with engines running. They were told to prepare helmets and, because Soviet soldiers are not supposed to be armed with rubber clubs, to devise wooden clubs, paint them green and attach rope loops to them so they couldn't be snatched away. The troops were then paraded in all their finery on the reviewing ground.

Who could guarantee that peaceful rallies would not turn nasty or that extremists would not try to break into the unit to steal weapons? The army, therefore, was taking all possible precautions.

It seemed that violent events in Tbilisi in 1956, in Temirtau 1959 and Novocherkassk in 1962, when tanks roared aggressively along the streets of these Soviet cities and innocent blood was shed, had been forgotton.

It seemed that references to non-existent orders were just as quickly forgotten.

The Commission of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies on last year's Tbilisi Events - where street violence was instigated by the Army during a peace rally - concluded that there was no written order, instead there were verbal requests from the Georgian Party leadership.

Despite the tragedy of Vilnius as recently as April 1989, when the Army flexed its muscle with devastating results, the local authorities in Baku were quite prepared to rely on a military presence to prevent potential trouble.

Notwithstanding Tbilisi and the USSR Supreme Soviet's hearing of the Sobchak-led commission, clubs and ammunition are being readied in one of the units of the Sverdlovsk garrison. This is being done in full awareness that the Army is neither militia nor the interior troops.

In a telephone call to Major Trofimov's flat in the evening of January 20, the chief of the Sverdlovsk garrison's personnel department told him that a special sub-unit was being formed for dispatch to Baku and suggested that Trofimov go there to take up a new position, without his subordinates.

At the time, Trofimov was not yet aware of the details of the Baku events, but he knew the difference between the words "we suggest" and "we order." It was suggested that he go. Trofimov refused.

It is clear that no one ever ordered the major to depart for Baku in either written or verbal form. Had the order been given, he would have been court-martialled captain Aleksandr Kalachev and Senior Lieutenant Arkadiy Charikov, parted ways with the Army for refusing to obey it. But the order was never given.

Within an hour of the alleged Baku "suggestion" Trofimov was taking with Colonel Chizhov, chief of the formation's political department and with various generals. He reiterated that he had no desire to go to Baku as a volunteer since he was opposed to handing police functions over to the Army.

Two days later Trofimov was called before the commander of the Volga-Ural Military District. But instead of going there he was taken to the efficiency rating commission.

Major M. Shro, acting battalion commander, had no right to submit a report putting the officer on trial by the

board of officers without a preliminary investigation on the major's army service. But he was ordered to write the report so he did just that.

Most officers supported Trofimov, yet the decision to dismiss him was made solely by the three members of the board. Their decision was purely arbitary even though the commander has the power to veto decisions. But is was useless trying invoke the law in its proper form.

P. Nikiforov, the military procurator, explained in writing that the "complaints against servicemen, connected with their performance are reviewed in conformity with the Interior Service Regulations and the Disciplinary Regulations of the USSR Armed Forces", in other words, through channels.

A decision passed by the board of officers can be appealed within ten days. Trofimov did this the same day but was told that it was too late. "Your documents are no longer here, major," said an official in the personnel department. "The order was to send them to higher instances. And we have lost the minutes of the meeting."

Even this didn't seem to be enough. On February 5, on instructions from the chief of the formation's political department, the battalion commander wanted criminal proceedings to be instituted against Trofimov. But the lawyers said a case could only be brought up before January 30. Without batting an eye the date on the title sheet was quickly changed to the 30th. The case was therefore dropped due to the absence of hard evidence.

Why was the major dealt with in such a brutal way? It's obvious he was used as a scapegoat to teach the others a lesson.

The truth is elusive given the fog of secrecy enveloping the armed forces. What remains to be done is to suppose that, having received an instruction in whatever form, a narrow circle of servicemen started fulfilling it. In this particular case, the officer corps for dispatch to Transcaucasia was formed on a voluntary basis.

Officials I talked to insisted that in the army it was customary to understand any proposal from above as an order. But whenever the Army is enlisted to maintain public order, this calls for explicit and exhaustive legislative regulation.

Trofimov was not the only one to act this way. Many officers are tired of being mindless executors of any bidding.

Trofimov's fellow-officers, Cap- after refusing to accept the proposal to go to Transcaucasia [sentence as published].

I found it strange to listen to the charges of cowardice against Kalachev, who fought in Afghanistan where he was shell-shocked and was then awarded for battle merits. He consciously made a choice to leave. But to be left without a livelihood, without a flat, with a baby and a non-working wife—this also requires courage.

On their return from Baku, Lieutenant Ya. Pylilo, platoon leader, and Captain Yu Rey, company CO, submitted their reports on discharge form the Army.

"When we were sent to Azerbaijan, we were told we were going to fulfil our internationalistduty," Yuliy Rey told me.

"Familiar words, aren't they? In Baku our nerves were pitched to breaking point. And in retaliation to any shot fired, soldiers blindly fired back in every direction. I once witnessed how, having mistaken army observers on house tops for militants, they staged a veritable battle with cross fire.

According to the data of servicemen - USSR people's deputies - published in the press, some 30,000 officers requested discharge from the Army. It is the best and the brightest who are leaving. This is indeed an alarming symptom.

Lukyanov, Medvedev, Primakov Attend Opening

LD1406222590

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 14 June, during its "Vremya" newscast, broadcasts a video report on the Tchaikovsky International Contest, showing Lukyanov and Primakov seated on either side of an unidentified woman in a box at this evening's concert at the Grand Hall of the Conservatoire, to mark its opening. The "Vremya" announcer rounds off the report by saying that Comrades Lukyanov, Medvedev, and Primakov attended the opening concert.

Various Obkom First Secretaries Elected

PM3105094190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[UZTAG-TASS report under the rubric "Officially": "Party Conferences Held"]

[Text] Tashkent, 26 May—Oblast party conferences were held today in Tashkent, Andizhan, Gulistan, and Dzhizak. At the party conferences the following party obkom [oblast committee] first secretaries were elected: from Kara-Kalpak Oblast—S.D. Niyetullayev; from Andizhan Oblast—K.Kh. Khalmirzayev; from Bukhara Oblast—D.S. Yadgarov; from Dzhizak Oblast—E.T. Tursunov; from Kashka-Darya Oblast—A.R. Atadzhanov; from Namangan Oblast—B.A. Allamuradov; from Samarkand Oblast—P.M. Abdurakhmanov; from Syr-Darya Oblast—A.A. Aydarkulov; from Surkhan-Darya Oblast— Kh.E. Berdyyev; from Tashkent Oblast—S.M. Mamarasulov; from Fergana Oblast—Sh.M. Yuldashev; from Khorezm Oblast—R. Khudaybergenova.

Oblast party conferences also took place in Lipetsk, Murmansk, Novgorod, and Poltava. The following were

reelected party obkom first secretaries: from Lipetsk Oblast—V.V. Donskikh; from Novgorod Oblast—I.I. Nikulin; from Poltava Oblast—A.S. Myaketa; from Murmansk Oblast—S.L. Serokurov, former second secretary.

Defense Ministry Party Conference Held 8 Jun

WA1506130390

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 9 June in its Second Edition publishes on page 2 a report about the party conference held 8 June by the USSR Defense Ministry's main and central directorates and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. The report says that "Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, delivered the report 'On Progress in Discussing the Draft CPSU Platform and Statutes, Communists' Proposals for the 28th party congress, and the Tasks of Party Organizations.' "Basing itself on the opinion of primary party organizations, the party conference declared its support for the main provisions of the precongress documents and proposed to adopt them as the basis for discussion at the 28th CPSU Congress."

Stroyev Attends Opening of Leaseholders' Congress

PM0406144390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Yu. Medvedev report: "Entrepreneurs Meet"]

[Text] The First Congress of the USSR Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs opened yesterday in the House of Unions Hall of Columns in Moscow. It will resolve questions of developing new forms of economic management on the threshold of market relations and in the longer term, as well as organizational matters.

Ye. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, read out a greetings message from USSR President M.S. Gorbachev wishing the leaseholders and entrepreneurs successes in their work, which is of statewide and nationwide importance. A report was delivered by USSR People's Deputy P. Bunich, president of the union. He reported on the first results of the work of leasehold collectives, and their problems and plans.

Taking part in the discussion of the report were delegates from collectives in various sectors, eminent specialists, and academics. Many people noted that, despite the considerable growth in enterprises' production and social indicators, the ideas of the lease system have not yet become sufficiently widespread. The advantages of the new system should be demonstrated more convincingly in practice. The congress continues.

League of Communist Democrats Issue Statement

PM0406155990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondent Ye. Solomenko: "Discussion on Congress Eve"]

[Text] Leningrad—The Political Statement of the League of Communist Democrats is how a group of Leningrad social scientists have termed the draft program document they have drawn up for the 28th CPSU Congress.

It is proposed that this statement be widely discussed among Communists and nonparty people and be examined at the Leningrad Oblast party conference.

The drafters of the document propose submitting to a partywide referendum the question of renaming the CPSU the League of Communist Democrats, which "is a continuation of the cause of the left-wing Marxist current in the socialist revolutionary movement of Russia." The statement envisages, in particular, changing the organizational structure of the party "on the basis of the principles of federation and international solidarity," forbidding party apparatus workers to hold posts in nonparty public organizations, and forming the actual apparatus on a contractual and competitive basis.

It is also proposed to resolve the question of party property on the basis of Soviet legislation and to elect by the end of the year the first secretaries of rayon, city, oblast, and central republic party committees, members of the Politburo, and the general secretary of the party Central Committee by direct secret ballot on a multiple-candidate basis.

In the political sphere it speaks of cooperation between the party and all social formations, nations' right to self-determination—up to and including secession by constitutional means—and the switch to a real federation and observance of the Declaration of Human Rights. In the economic sphere it proposes reorganizing state enterprises into joint-stock, cooperative, and lease enterprises, developing cooperative and individual enterprises, fostering enterprise, and strengthening the social protection of the needy, the unemployed, and the disabled.

The League of Communist Democrats Political Statement is proposed as the basis for consolidating the whole of society and for achieving consensus within the party.

CPSU's Baklanov Cited on Kuzbass Situation

LD1106152590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 11 Jun (TASS)—Oleg Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has told a TASS correspondent that there is a serious delay in implementing the government's decisions on the Kuzbass which were adopted almost a year ago. The working people do not always benefit as they should from many matters which have been settled, like for example pensions, he went on. The Central Committee secretary visited Kemerovo oblast in late May and early June, meeting with working people at the Kuznetskiy and West Siberian metallurgical plants and a number of mines in the towns of Novokuznetsk and Kemerovo.

Speaing about the social situation, in particular housing, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said that an abrupt improvement in that area could not be expected immediately. Much depended on the local authorities. Other questions need to be tackled without delay by various departments.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary noted that certain forces are speculating on allegations to the effect that the workers' movement is cutting its ties with the CPSU. The Communist Party has always held to the positions of the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia and continues to do so. Those who plan to drive a wedge between the CPSU and the working class are hoping to exploit our mistakes, blunders, and procrastination, he declared.

Because of this situation, Oleg Baklanov said, it is now especially important to exercise tight control over the implementation of resolutions on the Kuzbass. In order to step up work to implement the protocol there must be a constant dialogue in Kemerovo oblast between government and local party, Soviet and trade union organs on the one hand, and workers' committees and councils on the other. There has to be a regular exchange of information about progress being made in meeting targets and implementing accords.

Baltic, Caucasus Problems Outlined

LD0706210890 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The Soviet Federation is living through a complicated period. The national revival processes in various republics assume the forms which sometimes threaten the very existence of the union. In any event, political methods should be sought to solve the arising problems. All this means there is a need to make compromises. It wouldn't be bad at all if the leaders of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia could also show the readiness for that. On 6 June a second meeting of the Baltic States Council took place in the Latvian resort city of Jurmala. Our commentator Vyacheslav Solovyev gives us this story: [passage omitted]

No matter how complicated the internal problems of the Baltic republics are, no matter how sharp their conflict with the central government is, all these differences bear a peaceful nature, so to speak.

The situation is different in another part of the Soviet Federation, in the Caucasus. The national revival process there was marred by violence. Problems that have been piling up for decades take now and then the form of senseless bloodshed. [passage omitted]

Our correspondent in Yerevan visited the headquarters of one of the self-defense units of the Armenian national army. The officer on duty told the journalists that they need weapons to protect the border with Azerbaijan, and civilians in the Armenian border villages. He said strict discipline was observed by self-defense units and they even have service cards. They are prohibited categorically from entering into any conflicts with the Soviet Army. When asked who took part in the events of 27 May in Yerevan, the commander in chief of the Armenian national army, (Raznik Vasilyan) said the incident had been provoked by the mafia. The mafia is against the democratization of the country, of our republic, he added. It is against the people.

Perhaps (Raznik Vasilyan) is correct, especially if we take into account the fact that armed clashes in Yerevan took place on the eve of the last round of elections to the Supreme Soviet of Armenia, during which representatives of the democratic forces were expected to win. But in any case the accumulation of weapons in this explosion-prone region will always be fraught with the danger of a bloodbath. Besides, banking on weapons in the conflict with the neighbouring republic can only lead to an impasse.

Frolov Discusses Socialism, Economy, Yeltsin

AU0706083390 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 3 Jun 90 p 4

[Evgeni Gavrilov report: "The Socialist Idea Has Not Lost Its Force of Attraction"]

[Text] We should not talk about a breakdown of the Communist parties in East Europe. It is a simple fact that everything that was artificially created in those countries has now been rejected. Periods of decline and ascendancy have always succeeded each other in the international communist movement. Today this movement is living through a period of crisis, but the socialist idea and its humanitarian nature have not lost their force of attraction. Relieved of the pressure exerted by politicians, life itself will indicate the correct trend of development. This is what Ivan Frolov, editor in chief of the Soviet daily PRAVDA, said at a meeting with journalists at the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] Election Club in Sofia.

According to him, the world's future civilization will be built on the backs of two whales—new technology and intellectual values, both of which should serve the interests of the individual.

The Soviet economy today can choose between different options for its development, Frolov said. One of these options is represented by investments in scientific-technical progress at the expense of resources invested in agriculture and everyday services, while the other alternative is to invest in the sphere of consumer goods. The Soviet Union will presumably select an intermediate solution.

The large administrative-bureaucratic institutions, which are opposed to numerous enterprises striving for independence, are still causing difficulties and obstructing the economic reform. The mutual coexistence of these two opposite trends in the Soviet Union's

economic life further complicates the country's economic problems, Frolov pointed out.

Asked about his evaluation of Boris Yeltsin's election to the post of RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman, Frolov replied that this fact can be interpreted from different points of view. Yeltsin has always been a good executive of the nomenaklatura whose methods of leadership can be defined as dictatorial, and half-Stalinist. Numerous intellectuals exist in the USSR who have contributed much more with their efforts to restructuring than Yeltsin. The PRAVDA editor in chief expressed amazement at the Bulgarian public's lack of information about the processes currently under way in the Soviet Union. They should not be judged only on the basis of strident newspaper statements, he said.

Bolshoy Leader Appeals for Improvements

LD0406225390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1930 GMT 4 Jun 90

[no video available]

[Excerpts] [Presenter] Part of the party committee of the State Academic Bolshoy Theater of the USSR went on hunger strike for 24 hours in Moscow today. The hunger strike was led by Yuriy Aleksandrovich Grigoryev, people's artiste of the USSR and secretary of the party committee.

[Grigoryev] We are protesting against the tyranny of the administration, against the rightless situation of artistes in the Bolshoy Theatre, against the suppression of a public organization, against the extinction of creative life. All this is happening because the best acting forces who do not agree with the opinion of the administration or of artistic directors are being driven out of the theatre. [passage omitted]

Soon, a situation may arise where there will be no one left in the theater, there will no longer be anyone to work there. It's not known what the administration is counting on.

We are making an appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the Moscow City Soviet, and the Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev Culture Fund, that an independent, competent commission be set up in order to investigate the state of affairs in the Bolshoy Theater. The theater calls for close attention. The theater can be restored. And that must be done without delay.

Resistance to Dismantling Nuclear Submarines

LD1306094790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0805 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow 13 June. (TASS)—There has been resistance in the Far East by the civilian population and navy which is without precedent in the Soviet Union, the weekly MOSCOW NEWS reported today. It started after the local paper VOSKHOD reported that a military department intends to turn a bay situated in right next to the town of Sovetskaya Gavan' and the settlement of Vanino into a "chopping board" for decommissioned nuclear submarines belonging to the Pacific Fleet.

There was a series of meetings. A ginger group set up a unified inter-rayon strike committee. There were calls for nuclear vessels to be picketed by land and sea.

Energetic protests by the 100,000-strong population of the coast compelled the chief of Sovetskaya Gavan' naval garrison, Vladimir Kuroyedov, to suspend the order from the commander of the Pacific Fleet on starting to unload the active cores containing nuclear fuel from the reactors. Public representatives were allowed to check the submarines where work had been planned.

The strike committee suspended a June general strike. The demands of local soviets and resolutions from meetings have been sent to the fleet headquarters: That a date for a withdrawal of submarines for dismantling be announced by 1 July.

Status, Funding of Presidency Legislated

PM1306161390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with V.G. Kucherenko, chairman of the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, by A. Sapsay; date, place of interview not specified: "What Is Stipulated for the USSR President"—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] [Sapsay] As is known, the USSR Supreme Soviet recently adopted the "Law on Protecting the Honor and Dignity of the USSR President" and the resolution on maintaining, serving, and protecting the USSR president. What does their adoption entail?

[Kucherenko] The USSR Supreme Soviet's Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals Committee and Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order Committee took the lead in adopting this law. It was prompted by the special role fulfilled by the USSR president and his great responsibility for the country's fate. Coupled with that, the Supreme Soviet received numerous citizens' appeals about the impermissibility of infringing the honor and dignity of the USSR president as head of the Soviet state. Such suggestions have also been voiced in the mass media.

Let me also remark that adoption of the law is associated not only with the impermissibility of infringing the president's honor and dignity, and of insulting and slandering him, but also with the need for better state provision for his protection, for material resources, and for opportunities to travel around the country and abroad. These questions found immediate reflection in the resolution on maintaining, serving, and protecting

the USSR president, the draft of which was compiled by the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and State Security Committee, and the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission and the Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union. In making these decisions the Supreme Soviet strove to create maximum opportunities for the president to execute his powers fully and freely. Furthermore, we proceeded from the premise that every citizen of our country should know about his president's conditions of life and work.

[Sapsay] The resolution sets, for example, the USSR president's salary at 4,000 rubles [R] a month taxable, and provides for residences in the Moscow region and the Crimea and an official apartment in Moscow, specially equipped modes of transportation, protection, and expenses for representative purposes. Could you draw an analogy with other countries? How far do our president's conditions of life and work correspond to the conditions of life and work of foreign heads of state?

[Kucherenko] While preparing this resolution the Supreme Soviet actually studied foreign countries' corresponding legislation. Let me point out straightaway that everything is considerably more modest in this country. Judge for yourselves. Compensation for the U.S. President's expenses, for example, is stipulated at $250,000 a year, $200,000 of which is a taxable allowance. The U.S. President also receives an annual nontaxable grant of $50,000. His living accommodation, public utilities, transportation, executive office, and other sundry expenses are paid for.

Former U.S. presidents receive a pension of around $100,000 a year and they retain protection for life and a small staff (an assistant and two secretaries) which is paid for by the state, and fixed appropriations are allocated for organizing the presidential archive (library).

So on this plane, figuratively speaking, there can be no comparisons.

I think that the conditions which the Supreme Soviet stipulated in its resolution, based on our current resources, are much more acceptable.

Take the salary, for example. In a poll deputies suggested all manner of rates. For instance, it was suggested fixing the president's salary at R2,500 a month, nontaxable. This proposal, although energetically discussed, was not backed in the end. And here's why: Under the proposal the president would be the only person in the country not paying tax on such a salary. In the end they agreed on 4,000. Allowing for the progressive tax, this will make a "net" R2,300. A salary which is not much higher than that of an academician or the director of a large industrial association.

In this way, by proposing norms already accepted today, the USSR Supreme Soviet's committees and commissions used as a basis the specific conditions of our country's life, taking account of the president's enormous work load. We also proceeded from the question of what status the head of the Soviet state—an enormous power exerting influence over the fate of the whole planet—merits, in order that this question was decided suitably, openly, and specifically.

The USSR Supreme Soviet supported this proposal by a majority of votes and adopted the appropriate resolution.

I will note in passing that, starting 1991, a special article will be specified in the USSR State Budget concerning the financing of the USSR president's work. Each time the state budget is approved this question will be examined by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Reader Questions Killing of Czar's Family

PM0606143190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Response to reader's letter from I. Kitayev, deputy director of the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute, as part of a feature prepared by L. Semenchuk, L. Ruzhentseva, and T. Kozlova under the "Question-Answer" rubric titled "At Your Request": "Did Lenin Know?"; first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] "Reports have begun to be circulated that the czar's family was shot with Vladimir Ilich Lenin's tacit consent. I can tolerate the fact that the court sentenced Nicholas II to death, but what about the minors, including girls, who were shot and finished off with bayonets?

"V. Petrakov, Dzerzhinsk, Donetsk Oblast."

I. Kitayev, deputy director of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, answers the letter's author:

"The Central Party Archive where all Vladimir Ilich's documentary legacy is kept contains no official documents to confirm V.I. Lenin's involvement—direct or indirect—in determining the Romanov family's abode, their transfer to Yekaterinburg, or the penalty imposed on them (execution on the night of 17 July 1918).

"All questions relating to the fate of Nicholas II and his family were under the jurisdiction of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. The archive only contains Protocol No. 159 from the Council of People's Commissars' sitting of 18 July 1918, signed by Lenin; this sitting heard and took cognizance of the extraordinary statement issued by Ya.M. Sverdlov, chairman of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, regarding the execution of former Czar Nicholas II on the decision of the Yekaterinburg Soviet. There are the memoirs of V.P. Milyutin, people's commissar for agriculture, about this

sitting which were published in the journal PROZHEKTOR No. 4, 1924, on page 10.

New Human Rights Committee Criticized

PM0706102190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by G. Ivanov-Smolenskiy: "If They Ring—Will They Open; About a Public Committee Created According to Old Canons"]

[Text] At the entrance to the private house I became ashamed. Ashamed that another door came unbidden to mind—the door leading into the apartment of that great citizen and number one defender of rights Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov. Open all day to all oppressed, humiliated, offended people, at best it was "shut" with a folded newspaper.

But in front of the door of the private residence of the country's academy of sciences two men in civilian clothes carefully studied my pass, looked for my name on a list and, failing to find it, let me in upon the assurance that I had been invited in addition to the list. I am sorry to say that I had to use guile inasmuch as its organizers had not thought of inviting any journalist to the constituent meeting of the Soviet public's committee for human rights and international humanitarian cooperation. Moreover, the "public" itself turned out to have been kept to a list at the meeting.

There is no point in spending a long time expatiating about what human rights, human dignity, and freedom are. I shall merely recall the words of the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved and proclaimed by the UN General Assembly in 1948: "...recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world." I think there is no need to recall how this principle, recognized by progressive mankind (the Declaration has also been signed by our state,) was distorted and flouted for decades in our country. After a brief thaw, a mere hint of social freedoms, human rights were again crucified and many participants in the rights movement which emerged were hidden away in prisons, in exile, or psychiatric hospitals, or banished abroad.

We realize that times have changed. But to say that, despite all the changes for the better, all the problems connected with rights and freedoms in our country have already been resolved would be an exaggeration. The 5 million unsettled complaints "doing the rounds" are, alas, not the only confirmation of that. In brief, the need for a movement for the defense of rights has not yet disappeared. The question is what kind of movement...

First of all its main tasks and goals were outlined for the new rights defense committee's constituent meeting. Everything went well here, in the spirit of fundamental international documents. But when have we ever been short of declarations or statements? Actually, on this occasion we could have treated them with the utmost trust had it not been for the circumstances and situation which preceded the procedure for the committee's creation. IZVESTIYA has already reported (issue No. 111 this year in an article entitled "Who Will Defend Right") the impudent and undemocratic steps of one of the committee's cochairmen (anticipating, I shall say that now he is the chairman) and about the strange complaisance and aloofness of the other four cochairmen and USSR people's deputies. The constituent meeting, essentially a secret meeting, took place in the same key.

Let us begin with the fact that the formula for invitation to such an important meeting, coordinated and approved by the action group, was violated. As a result many of those whose way of thinking and acting, whose civic stance would have been a guarantee of their usefulness to the cause of the defense of human rights did not get to the meeting. There was no room even for many members of the action group on the list at the entrance and consequently in the auditorium.

Next there came something even more surprising. The meeting's presenter said literally the following: "There are situations when alternative elections are only playing at democracy" and proposed as the committee's chairman D.A. Kerimov, department leader of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and a USSR people's deputy. He was elected with the complete unanimity of those assembled. The constituent meeting allowed itself even less "playing with democracy" when matters got to the election of the committee itself—the founders, whose numbers were only slightly greater, immediately voted in the entire list of 60 members of the committee...

So what kind of a committee has been formed under the stucco vaults and in the midst of the marble columns of the academy residence? The most surprising thing is that the Soviet Public's Committee for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Cooperation contains almost none of the people who would be known to the country (I do not even mention the "rest" of the world) as **defenders of rights.** It includes people who are undoubtedly authoritative and have shown themselves in the field of, for instance, culture, the trade union movement, or education, and there are lawyers, ecologists, and diplomats. But, alas, there are only a few fighters on the committee, fighters for social, political freedoms, citizens who have already **proven** their ability to defy any unjust will whether it comes from above or below.

Actually, I foresee two objections. The first is that the new organization's statute defines human rights broadly—not only political rights but also economic, ecological, national, and other rights. Consequently, specialists are needed here. Be that as it may, these rights and freedoms have always been the result of political and social freedoms. That means that the nucleus of a rights defense organization should nonetheless consist of people of strong political temperament and unswerving

civic will. I repeat, such people are on the committee, but they are blatantly not in the majority.

The second objection is one of those heard at the meeting—that we should not be geared toward past merits, let's wait and see how the committee works. Well, evolution in views and positions, especially at turning points of history, is an entirely natural affair. Only I am still convinced that in a field requiring the utmost certainty and political nakedness, in the struggle for human rights the evolution from conformism and total obedience to "pride of thought" and fearlessness of action should have materialized earlier. Only a sharpened **social conscience** which has already **been manifested** gives a person the moral right to head a movement for the defense of rights and freedoms.

The list of the new committee does not include many authoritative people with an independent civic voice who initially belonged to the organizational committee—people's deputies F. Burlatskiy, A. Yezhelev, A. Likhanov, Yu. Platonov, S. Fedorov, A.M. Yakovlev, writers V. Astafyev, V. Belov, and S. Zalygin, the well known lawyers M. Marchenko, V. Miller, and R. Myullerson, Metropolitan Yuvenaliy of Krutitsy and Kolomenskoye, the producers T. Abuladze and N. Mikhalkov.... On the pretext of "an end to the meetings period in the rights defense movement," the organizers of the constituent meeting contrived to bypass the fighters for human rights of the sixties to the early eighties, whose civic awareness and courage actually gave rise to the very concept of "rights defender." Or rather, through an "oversight," at the very last moment RSFSR People's Deputy S. Kovalev and another two or three people whom—whether we like it or not—the international public knows as representatives of the traditions of the rights defense movement in the Soviet Union were proposed.

Alas, with this approach, which was stringently maintained on the eve of the constituent meeting, the formation of the committee could not have ended otherwise. Backstage intrigues and a public movement, especially in a delicate social matter like human freedoms and rights, are incompatible. It was precisely playing and intrigues right up to, how shall I put this as mildly as possible, misleading memorandums to the president, which led to the point where the initial aim itself has been put under a big question mark. Even several question marks.

The committee, at the chairman's proposal, has decided to meet again and to return to the statute, with addenda this time, only... in September. But is it sensible or tolerable to put off such an urgent question for a whole three months? The new rights defenders were also worried by the prospect of engaging "in earnest" in the fates of their oppressed fellow citizens ("we will be swamped and paralyzed by the wave of complaints"). It was evidently for purposes of reassurance that they removed from the draft statute the clauses on immediate assistance to those whose rights have been infringed, on the drawing of public attention to them, on solidarity campaigns, and "other public measures." In principle this generalized methodological approach has the right to exist, there are precedents abroad. But will it be understood or accepted by people whose personal, individual rights have been flouted for decades? They know the sorry principle that if there's no person there's no problem. Finally, when talk turned to the committee's funds, the response was something vague about "its own economically accountable activity." A "candle factory" is understandably a tempting venture but while the case is being heard on whose subscriptions and dues will the committee leaders travel to international rights defense forums? The Soviet Peace Fund at least is in no hurry so far to allocate money to the human rights committee. Finally there is a question for the actual members of the rights defense committee: What kind of organization have they joined so cheerfully and eagerly if it does not even have an approved statute?

Of course any citizen of the fatherland has the right, having collected even a few like-minded people, to announce, within the framework of the Constitution, the creation of whatever committee he likes. Including a human rights committee. But calling oneself, without the slightest uncertainty, a "committee for the Soviet public..." How many committees in offices of all kinds have existed and continue to exist, created behind society's back. Often hastily, on the eve of an event, an international symposium for instance...

On leaving the residence and the constituent meeting I again recalled Academician Sakharov and his reply to the question why he did not lock his door. The reply was disarmingly human and guileless: "If they ring, I open it anyway."

Yeltsin Book on Sale in Sverdlovsk

LD1306115490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's book "Confession on a Given Theme" [Ispoved na Zadannuyu Temu] has appeared on the shelves of bookshops in his home town of Sverdlovsk, in an edition of 300,000 copies. The book has been published by an association of Uralsk publishing houses. The interest in it is great because the author talks frankly about how his own internal perestroyka took place, a process being experienced by many people in the country. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has donated the whole fee from the publication to the fund to fight AIDS.

Tyumen Store Sells Goods Cheap to Pensioners

PM1206140790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 11 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by A. Shvetsov, U. Lunev, identified by caption, on measures in Tyumen Oblast to assist pensioners during transition to market relations]

[Text] [Announcer] During our society's transition to a regulated market economy the problem of the social protection of citizens, especially pensioners, is becoming topical.

[Correspondent] In one Tyumen store a special department has been opened on the initiative of the oblast's Main Trade Administration. [video shows street scene followed by interior of store department where old people are shopping] All sorts of essential consumer goods are being sold here to those who are least protected against the vicissitudes of the market, that is, pensioners with an income of no more than 70 rubles per month. During the shooting of this reportage we counted dozens of types of goods on the department's shelves which are very hard to obtain in so-called free trade. But the main point is that all this is being offered at low, entirely acceptable prices. This is why virtually no one who calls at the department leaves without making a purchase.

What is your attitude to this department, what can you say?

[L.M. Dukhovina, an elderly client, identified by caption] It is most convenient, of course. I cannot really afford to buy anything. But I bought myself a pair of sandals for the summer. That is wonderful, of course. I cannot tell you how many stores I have been to, but I could not find any anywhere.

[Correspondent] There are no particular problems here. I suppose you need your passport or your pension card?

[A.V. Fedyushina, another elderly client, identified by caption, showing her identification papers] Look, these are my papers.

[Correspondent] So all you need to do is come here and buy what you want?

[A.V. Fedyushina] Quite so, quite so. You can buy what you need. Many, many thanks.

[V.F. Shuglya, Tyumen Oblast Soviet Executive Committee Main Trade Administration chief, identified by caption] Our task today is to ensure that people on low incomes can obtain the goods which we have at low prices. You have seen one such department at the "Bogatyr" store. At this store some 1,500 people per day are able to purchase goods, albeit not in the quantities which we would like to have. Our paramount task is to broaden as much as possible the range of goods which we offer the population. We are working toward this, working persistently to establish contacts with industry. And the second task is to ensure that there are as many departments of this kind as possible, that they exist in every population center, in every city. This has to be organized on the same lines as the provision of food for our veterans, pensioners, and so on and so forth....

[Newscaster] I must say, reportages like this one make you feel sad. The measures which trade workers are taking to provide pensioners with at least some goods are probably the only correct measures at this stage. But these measures are based on our weakness. And only the market will help to create an abundance of goods, and only higher pensions will improve pensioners lives. This is what we will have to accept.

Economic

Fuel Shortages 'Extremely Serious' in Regions

LD1406172990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] You will now see a report from Krasnodar Kray on the shortage of fuel. Unfortunately, such reports are coming in from the Crimea, Leningrad Oblast, and other regions. The problem is extremely serious. After all, leaving aside passenger transport, vehicles will soon be engaged in the highly intensive work of bringing in the harvest and carrying it away, and measures must be taken urgently.

[Correspondent V. Obraztsov] Perhaps the busiest road at this time of year, the road from the Kuban to Novorossiysk is now unusually empty. The reason is quite clearly stated on notices that are displayed instead of gasoline at gas stations. [video shows two notices in a garage window: "no gas" and "no oil"] There is insufficient gas not only for private cars, but for official ones as well. And even the cancellation of the last privilege—coupons for priority service at gas stations for the cars of leading personnel—has not, of course, solved the fuel problem. The Krasnodarnefteprodukt Association has announced that the stocks of motor-vehicle gasoline are significantly down from last year's. On the eve of harvesting, the stocks of motor-vehicle gas on the kray's farms currently amounts to one-third of last year's amount and only half as much at Krasnodarnefteprodukt enterprises.

Individual motorists may well be able to put up with the exhausting queues for fuel, but the grain that is just about to ripen cannot wait.

Abalkin Highlights Goals of Reform Program

904A0422A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNI in Russian No 23, Jun 90 pp 6-7

[Report on interview with Academician L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform, conducted by Yu. Rytov; place and date not given: "May the Discussion Be Sensible"]

[Text] [Rytov] Leonid Ivanovich, the concept of transition to a controlled market economy is based on the formation of new forms of ownership and new types of economic activity. Obviously this process will depend to a decisive extent on initiative "from below"—from both the work force and individual citizens. And it is difficult

controlling such a process "from above." Land cannot be leased or collective enterprises created, say, compulsorily. I would like you in this connection to evaluate once again the role of the center—the government departments—in the realization of the concept. What levers—economic and administrative—does the center have at its disposal for accelerated transition to the market?

[Abalkin] The answer to this question is of fundamental significance for realization of the entire program of transition to a controlled market economy. It is necessary primarily to complete work on the creation of the organizational and legal conditions of the functioning of the market. A whole package of new documents will be drawn up by the government and submitted to the fall session of the Supreme Soviet. Not much time remains and it is important that this entire package of laws, well conceived and interconnected, be enacted and take effect not later than 1 January 1991. However, knowing the practice of the passage of drafts through the Supreme Soviet, it is not difficult to predict that their enactment could be delayed.

On the other hand, incompleteness in the creation of the organizational and legal principles of the reform would deprive the whole work of comprehensiveness and would not yield effective results. For this reason it is envisaged that on a number of issues the government will independently adopt provisional regulations making it possible to begin practical steps toward the market. This applies to legislation governing stock companies, small businesses, antitrust measures, and others.

Considering the importance of all the said problems, the central place in the government program—although the deputies have not reacted all that precisely to this—has been occupied by questions of a renewal of ownership relations and the creation of a fundamentally new motivational mechanism of the behavior of people and the work force. After all, the market can function efficiently only given a combination of the most diverse forms of ownership and different types of the organization of economic life, including state-owned and stock enterprises, leaseholder collectives and cooperatives of various types, family enterprises and private farms, and individual labor activity.

It is no less important creating a dependable motivational mechanism stimulating enterprise, initiative, and intensive work. The market itself forms a nutrient medium for such behavior. Its stabilization and saturation with merchandise and the possibility of the acquisition of the most diverse goods for money earned, including securities and real estate, create sufficiently powerful incentives to enterprise.

What is the center's role in the solution of these questions? It cannot in principle directly influence each individually functioning link and each subject of economic relations. Its task is to create the overall conditions of their rational functioning; that is, to create the standard and other conditions to ensure that initiative from below may really manifest itself.

Paramount significance is attached to the creation of the market environment. The way to this lies primarily via a reform of pricing. It amounts to fundamentally new approaches to the formation of prices with regard for supply and demand and contract relations between the producers and the consumers of the products, naturally tith the use of the appropriate regulators—in the form, for example, of upper price levels or strict tax regulation—to prevent an unjustified increase therein. An essential change in interest policy, which is designed to ensure a quest for the most efficient solutions and stimulate or curb investment activity, is also essential.

But the center has other possibilities also. They are connected primarily with the transformation of ownership relations. As you know, there are today three levels of state ownership—union, republic, and local (municipal). There is also a diversity of centers: the union government, the republic government, and the local executive authorities. Within the framework of their jurisdiction, they may purposefully control the process of the denationalization of property. It is entirely within their powers to transfer enterprises of the pertinent levels to a stock enterprise mode with retention of the controlling block in the hands of the center, and the extensive attraction of the financial resources of both allied subcontractor enterprises interested in the development of this industry and of the work force directly. There is a change in ownership relations here, and with the sale of stock to the enterprise's workers new motivational mechanisms take shape. The participation in this work of the republic and local authorities will stimulate transition to the market even further.

[Rytov] It is perfectly legitimate that the section dealing with the reform of retail prices was presented in a separate document. Of course, this is a most painful matter requiring the broadest public discussion. Additional explanations are needed here, in my view, on a number of items. First, losses from the increase in retail prices will constitute approximately 200 billion rubles. Seventy percent of this sum will be returned to the population in compensation. How will the remainder be used—to eliminate the gap in the budget or for specific social programs which are not currently backed by real financing? Second, the government will obtain a vote of confidence for implementation of its program only after nationwide discussion of the draft retail price reform. And if this is a referendum, although its mechanism has not been perfected as yet, we may hardly anticipate approval being forthcoming. Our people are already too sated with promises and their faith in the planned social assurances is too weak....

[Abalkin] Reporting its proposals to the Supreme Soviet, the government endeavored not to soften the difficulties of transition to a controlled market economy, not to

conceal the possible negative consequences of this transition and to say honestly what effect this would have on people's living standard.

So what is the situation here? The increase in retail prices as of 1 January 1991 proposed by the government is, predominantly, to be compensated. It is, after all, a question of an increase in prices of goods in mass demand constituting the basis of each family's consumption. In this case full compensation is essential.

Expenditure connected with the acquisition of gold, jewelry, imported video equipment, fish delicacies, and certain other commodities which, as can be seen from the list, are not basic necessities, will not be compensated. Naturally, the noncompensable part of the revenue will affect the interests of by no means the entire population, but only of its most prosperous part which has acquired or will acquire the corresponding commodities. I hope that this decision will be received in society with understanding. It is difficult to forecast the results of the nationwide discussion, but the job is to try to persuade people of the good sense and fairness of this approach.

As far as the sum which has been saved is concerned, it should go not toward the additional financing of any activities for this would lead to an additional discharge of money onto the consumer market and would in no way contribute to its recovery. The remainder is earmarked precisely for recovery, for the closing of the huge gap between consumer demand and the actual possibilities of satisfying it with goods and services. This should contribute accordingly to a reduction in the budget deficit.

We are invoking in the discussion of the problems which have now arisen not the people's faith and not their uncomplaining trust—we are looking for good sense, reasonableness, and objective evaluations. We have set course toward democracy and the power of the people, and we must make the people the supreme arbiter of the country's fate adopting the most responsible decisions. It is important to persuade people that there is no other path to the creation of a modern highly efficient economy, the awakening of labor assertiveness, and a better life, and that any delay and procrastination will result in even bigger losses. Without switching to the market, we will be unable to conquer the chronic deficit, profiteering, and the activity of the shadow economy. And we should not now be worrying how the government should be acting if it is not supported. This would not be the greatest tragedy. It is far more important preventing a tragedy of a more serious nature; namely, the huge sacrifices which will have to be borne by the people if they do not support and do not appreciate the need for the proposed measures and do not display a willingness to implement them.

[Rytov] Given the new spiral of strain on the consumer market, certain regions of the country are adopting protective measures to reduce exports of their commodities. We recall, for example, the recent decisions of the Moscow City Soviet. If such a trend continues we will have, instead of the single all-Union market to which we aspire, a multitude of regional markets: the Moscow, Ashkhabad, Kishinev, Yaroslavl markets. What kind of solution to this situation may be found?

[Abalkin] The protective measures being adopted locally have deeper roots. They came to be implemented long before the question of an increase in retail prices, including bread and bakery products, arose. Their sources are associated with the overall imbalance in the economy and the strain on the consumer market. The sale of commodities for coupons via the enterprises and a variety of departmental distributors are now prevalent. And it needs to be clearly understood that without the creation of market structures, without the creation of a really functioning market, these processes will lead to disconnection and regional exclusiveness.

Transition to the market should afford any producer an opportunity to freely sell his products (over and above fulfillment of a government order or other standard supplies) in any part of the country, and outside it also on the world market. The subjects of the market are not the oblast and not the republic; the subjects of the market are the commodity producers and they should obtain the maximum freedom for their activity. On the other hand, the creation of overall balance on the market—both consumer and producer goods—is the concern of the state authorities. They may to this end avail themselves of control prices, tax concessions, credit rates, and budget subsidies.

Under market conditions the problem of "obtaining" and "purchasing" will be replaced by that of "selling," finding a consumer for the product and persuading him to purchase precisely this product of precisely this enterprise, and not of some other. It is for this that advertising and a strong marketing system exist. But in order for such a situation to evolve and for such happy times to come, it is necessary to go through the crucible of purification, through a belt-tightening period as they usually say. Without this, the goal will not be achieved. Overcoming all these regional sentiments and exclusiveness is possible, once again, only via transition to the market. There is no other way. Neither science nor world practice offer a different method of creating a balanced, efficiently functioning market.

[Rytov] The concept envisages a smooth transition to the market. Specifically, it is contemplated next year keeping the government order at the 40-45 percent level. This is for the majority of manufacturers a perfectly acceptable level, it would seem. But serious misgivings are emerging even here. First of all, the average level of the government order by no means signifies that it will be such for each individual enterprise. Will we not continue to have, as before, enterprises where the government order takes up 100 percent of the program? And as far as we know,

will the government order even be, as before, of a compulsory nature and not placed on a mutually profitable and competitive basis?

[Abalkin] Yes, the level of the government order will be very different for different enterprises and sectors. And this could be dictated by various factors, the nature of the manufactured product for example. Is it possible to imagine that an enterprise mining for gold or diamonds would be able to trade freely or tout for custom for itself? The purchase of these products is the exclusive monopoly of the state.

Enterprises which are monopolists in their sphere will be maintained here—and will be maintained inevitably for a certain length of time. Could we here also speak of the legitimacy of the free market sale of products at freely evolving prices? There simply could not be such given 100-percent monopolization. Otherwise we would have not a market and not free prices but diktat, entirely unlimited frequently. And for this reason it is necessary for the state to intervene here also with the possible purchase of these products.

As far as the conditions of placement of the government order are concerned, it will evidently be necessary for the transitional period—for the next two years—to employ a combined system, for example on the one hand to create maximum interest and employ special benefits and tax benefits. And within the framework of their share of the taxes, what is more, such benefits could be afforded by both the union government and the governments of the union republics and the local authorities, acquiring thereby the right to order a product necessary for the solution of the corresponding problems.

On the other hand, it is necessary prior to a radical transition to market conditions to have a certain reserve of strength of the economic system and a guarantee of the state's acquisition of the necessary resources. For this reason the obligatory nature of the government order will continue for some time. The stabilization of the market and the formation of new principles of economic management will make it possible gradually not only to reduce appreciably the share of the government order, but also switch to new principles of its formation, including placement on a competitive basis.

[Rytov] It is clear to every unbiased individual who has familiarized himself closely with the government concept that this is a balanced, well considered document which has concentrated the best achievements of economic thought and which is the sole one possible under the present conditions of our economic management. Nonetheless, the concept has been sharply criticized from both right and left in the country's Supreme Soviet. How do you assess the debate?

[Abalkin] The four days of debate produced many impressions. Making an unequivocal evaluation of the debate evidently is not possible. There were many sensible proposals clarifying the government concept, revealing its contradictions, and suggesting ways of improving it. And all this needs to be adopted in the preparation of the enforceable enactments and the system of laws and government decisions which I mentioned at the start of the interview.

But I would be insincere were I not to mention that some of the people's deputies' pronouncements evoke a negative response. Deliberate distortion of the actual essence and nature of the document submitted by the government, the extraction of individual propositions and their criticism outside the overall concept of transition to the market, the predominance of emotions over logic and analysis, and the transference to the work of parliament of mass-meeting passions are encountered here.

It is possible to become accustomed to this and treat it with relative composure and restraint. But it cannot, after all, be forgotten that all this is spraying out onto millions and tens of millions of people who watch the transmissions of the Supreme Soviet sessions daily. Passions are being inflamed and discontent with everything and everyone is being aroused, and the already overheated atmosphere in the country is being seriously destabilized.

Examples and figures with nothing in common with actual reality are being cited frequently. High-handed judgments pronounced with glib assurance show the incompetence of the speakers and simply their misunderstanding of the essence of the issue. A student of an economics higher educational institution—and not only a Soviet one but any foreign institution also—would get a grade of two for such statements. However, a people's deputy is immune and his pronouncements do not encounter the necessary refutation. A corresponding mechanism of protection against incompetence with the participation of science and the mass media should evidently be created in society, ultimately with the participation of the electorate itself which should be countering such trends.

I would like to call attention to one further aspect. A roll call vote was conducted several months ago during discussion of the government program in the Congress of People's Deputies. A roll call vote is a double-edged thing. It provides a full list of those who at that time voted for the government program and those who voted against. I would recall that the congress was quite unanimously in favor of the government program, a minority being opposed. So who is today sharply and at times unfairly criticizing the new government documents? Those who were opposed on the last occasion. One has the impression that, not having won support in the congress, these people would like today to take revenge. And the logic of struggle dictates their line of behavior also.

The government has revised, reconsidered, and clarified a great deal in its plans for economic recovery and transition to the market and has displayed a sense of realism and an understanding of the changing situation

and the need for the adjustment of its plans and proposals. However our opponents have not, it seems to me, followed this example and are continuing in the main to reiterate arguments expressed earlier.

[Rytov] New authorities continue to be formed in the union republics. As you know, their platforms do not on a number of most important points always coincide with the government concept. This will obviously make extra difficulties for its final elaboration and realization?

[Abalkin] We are moving toward a state based on the rule of law and must be strictly guided by the current constitution and the laws which are in force. The USSR Government is the highest organ of executive authority in the country and it is obliged to strictly and consistently observe both constitutional provisions and current legislation. Authorities whose purpose is to monitor compliance with the laws, primarily the USSR Constitution, are being created in the country also.

It may be anticipated that the authorities created in the republics following the elections will act more assertively, perfect the structure of the organs of administration, and adopt new legislative enactments. This is a normal process and it needs to be welcomed. It will permit the more even distribution of responsibility between the center and the republics and regions, the commissioning of new creative forces, forces of renewal and progress, and fuller consideration of local singularities. I repeat, this needs only to be welcomed and seen as a powerful stimulus for the acceleration of perestroyka, for the efficient formation of a controlled market included.

However, such processes also must develop in the channel of a law-based state. The laws which are enacted must not be contrary to constitutional provisions. Such processes must be under the efficient and effective supervision of the legislators and those who safeguard the law.

We have endured much through lawlessness which was characteristic of our history, not only in the past 70 years but possibly throughout the preceding millennial existence of our state. Lawlessness with us is embedded in our genes. But if we wish to be a civilized state based on the rule of law, we must change our genetic heritage, our stereotypes, and our aspiration to anarchy and separatism. I hope that the newly formed representative organs and organs of administration will have sufficient common sense and political maturity and a sense of responsibility for the decisions they adopt.

[Rytov] Your motto is: Always and under all circumstances tell people the truth. How do you evaluate the development of events in the next few years? When, in your view, will market relations begin to work and produce tangible results?

[Abalkin] The development of events is characterized by quite a high degree of uncertainty, and for this reason an unambivalent appraisal is very difficult. However, it may be anticipated as a whole that at the transitional stage, which will take up the next two years approximately, there will be a painful process of the formation of market structures and market relations. Initially success may be expected only in individual sectors, primarily where greater flexibility of the structures may be secured. I refer to the formation of new forms of economic management in agriculture and in services and in the creation of small businesses, from the manufacture of consumer goods through the introduction of S&T achievements. Serious changes—I mean propitious changes—which will be reflected in a rise in the population's living standard may be expected only in two years' time.

Such a forecast is based on the serious expert appraisals which we have conducted and a number of calculations made on models predicting such a version of the development of events. However, no variant calculations and no statistical computations are capable of catching fundamental changes which are more of a psychological and socio-moral nature. If the government program is supported, if it itself is able to implement it consistently and decisively, a radical recovery may be expected by the start of next year even.

Of course, the living standard will not rise immediately. This is simply physically impossible. For this it is necessary to have not simply more money—there is a surplus as it is—but more merchandise, material benefits, and services. And they will not appear immediately with the transition to the new conditions of economic management next January. This is unrealistic. Nonetheless, the situation will change abruptly if the market is saturated with consumer goods. Albeit given high prices but without lines, without profiteers, without a closed distribution system. After all, this will be an entirely different situation, a different socio-moral climate in the country! There will emerge in people a feeling of confidence, stability, and protection. I mean protection against speculators, the demeaning standing in line, and the solicitation of coupons. On the other hand, a powerful incentive to labor, to an increase in one's income, is being created.

Naturally, effective measures of the social protection of the needy strata of the population must be applied here. The latter's income must be sufficient for them always and under all circumstances to be able to acquire the most basic necessities, if not the most fashionable and most costly then those which ensure at least the minimum conditions for a normal life, assured and stable. And such measures of social protection must naturally be of an anticipatory nature.

[Rytov] And the final question. For the majority of our fellow citizens the market economy is, as they say, a dark forest and they have a very murky idea of it. A great deal of explanatory work is obviously needed here. What would you recommend for our newspaper in this connection?

[Abalkin] We are living in real time. We are encountering a mass of contradictions. Yes, considerable numbers of the population have an inadequate knowledge of what a market economy is and have not determined upon their behavior under the new conditions. But, on the other hand, we cannot put off transition to these new conditions, we must act energetically to prevent a deepening of the crisis and to reach the point of our economy's healthy development quickly.

We must combine in time all processes in order not to postpone and not drag out transition to the market. This is the real contradiction which we are encountering at every step. And for this reason we need to very vigorously introduce in the public consciousness modern ideas concerning the economy and the market and its categories. This cannot be purely educational work. It must be built on actual living processes, on real situations.

I believe that PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK should enter into contact with the pertinent government establishments—with the Commission for Economic Reform and the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy for example—and in conjunction with them organize systematic consistent work on an explanation of the problems of the market economy. Then all this could be collated and published in the form of a separate book.

I would like to hope merely that the editorial office not oversimplify problems, not conceal difficulties, and conduct a cogent and honest and open discussion without avoiding the sharp edges. Winning people's understanding is possible only given the sincerity, honesty, and depth of the material published.

To our readers: In a coming issue we will begin under the editorship of Academician L.I. Abalkin a new column—"School of the Market Economy". We request, dear readers, that you write and tell us what problems you are encountering which you would like to see discussed in our paper.

Petrakov Discusses Differences in Reform Approach

WA0706183890 Moscow POISK in Russian No 18, 4-10 May 90 pp 4-5

[Report on interview with Nikolay Petrakov, USSR people's deputy, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, aide to the USSR President, by POISK political commentator Lyudmila Telen; place, date not specified: "The Market Price"]

[Text] **In 1971, shortly before defending his doctoral dissertation, Nikolay Petrakov published an article on the issue of markets in NOVYY MIR. The material was immediately reprinted abroad. PRAVDA responded to it with sharp criticism. The author was referred to as "a market socialist," which at that time was a political rather than a scientific assessment. Petrakov's book, "Cybernetic Problems of Managing the Economy," which was published in 1974 was greeted with no less devastating criticism. After that, no publishing house accepted manuscripts from "market socialists" for many years. The leaders of the country, having come to their senses after the 1965 reform, were zealously restoring administrative-command rules in the economy. The "market people" turned out to be not only unnecessary but also dangerous.**

Many years had to pass before political leaders came to need the economists of the "market school." Leonid Abalkin became deputy prime minister, Stanislav Shatalin became member of the Presidential Council. Nikolay Petrakov took the post of aide to the USSR president for economic issues. Their time came.

Meanwhile, doubts are overwhelming our society once again. It is the fifth year since it was proclaimed that the country was taking the market route, but the economy is in the throes of an increasingly destructive crisis. Price increases, inflation, falling volumes of production.... Have we chosen the right path? Is it not time to turn back? These questions are being asked more and more frequently not only in lines but also in newspaper articles, at the rallies of the United Workers Front, and at AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] plenums. Will the government succeed in offering a radical concept of our transition to the market and, mainly, implementing it? Will our society respond to this resolve by a social explosion? Nikolay Petrakov, USSR people's deputy, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and aide to the USSR president, ponders these and other questions in a conversation with our political columnist, Lyudmila Telen.

[Telen] Nikolay Yakovlevich, I remember well how sharply you came out against the draft budget and plan for 1990, submitted by the government at the fall session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and still more sharply against the government measures to invigorate the economy, which were submitted to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Did it not seem to you at the time that the government was being indecisive, that a market would not be built through its programs? Now that the same government has declared that it intends to accelerate the reform you once again oppose it. You, Stanislav Sergeyevich Shatalin, Oleg Timofeyevich Bogomolov, and Abel Gezevich Aganbegyan spoke in the Presidential Council criticizing the new government proposals. Was this not strange—all of you are market people since before perestroyka, and suddenly you failed to support the idea of a dash to the market? How is this to be explained?

[Petrakov] While we fought the administrative-command economy everything appeared to be clear. The old system was inefficient, it needed to be destroyed, and a market needed to be restored. However, the following question came up: Precisely how are goods-and-money relations to be reconstructed in a country in which they were virtually destroyed, and some confusion set in among the economists. Should all the floodgates be opened right away? However, given our conditions, the

market will not kick in anyway. Theoretically this is absolutely obvious. But here is the Mazowiecki government implementing its reforms successfully before our very eyes, and the illusion develops that since it worked for the Poles it will also work for us. Personally, I doubt it very much.

[Telen] I also think that there are considerable grounds for doubts. Differing attitudes toward the government, which has proclaimed the radical reform, are virtually the most essential point. The Mazowiecki "team" is supported by more than 90 percent of the citizens, despite the gravity of the economic situation. According to some estimates, the Ryzhkov "team" has the support of only 20 percent. The statistics may be disputed, but the fact remains: Our government is forced to act in an environment of extreme wariness on the part of "the lower strata."

[Petrakov] Indeed, this is an essential difference. However, there are purely economic peculiarities as well. Since approximately 1980, the Poles have lived in an environment of colossal inflation. They have gotten used to the race of prices. This is the first point. Secondly, inflation has depreciated all of their savings. Our situation is fundamentally different. Our society clearly prefers rationing to abundance at high prices. Besides, savings going into many billions of rubles put pressure on the market.

[Telen] So, did the measures submitted by the government to the Presidential Council approximate "the Mazowiecki scenario?"

[Petrakov] To a considerable degree. Free prices and the independence of enterprises are the main ideas from which the new government concept proceeds. However, let us really take a sober view of things: Under the conditions of a monopolized economy, this will bring about an insane growth in prices and windfall profits for monopolies. It will not bring about a market, however. A market is impossible without competition. Incidentally, we do not know this from theory only. The Law on State Enterprises, which gave the monopoly producers just a little bit of freedom, immediately caused price increases, a deterioration in quality, and even a drop in output.

Cooperatives are another example which is no less instructive. We did everything possible to ensure that new entrepreneurs have as few competitors as possible—taxes, monstrous prices for raw materials and equipment, the most complex system of registration. Meanwhile, it was initially expected that local organs would register all cooperatives whose operation is not prohibited by law, without exception. Had we not abandoned this principle, prices in cooperatives, as well as the incomes of cooperative members, would have been quite different. What about now? How long has Fedorov's cooperative restaurant been in business on Kropotkinskaya Street? Three or four years? Not a single new cooperative cafe has appeared on this street during this time. Is this normal? As a result, we have a situation with our cooperatives which is quite similar to the one existing in the state sector—the absence of competition, high monopoly prices, windfall profits.

We will exacerbate a hundred times the situation which is difficult to begin with if we begin our movement toward the market with the freedom of prices and producers. Will we ever learn how to learn from at least our own mistakes?

[Telen] What about the approach to the reform of pricing itself which is built into the new concept? Does it not run counter to the principles of a market economy? As far as I remember, all previous proposals proceeded from the center wisely raising prices for some goods and wisely reducing them for others....

[Petrakov] Unfortunately, this approach is still alive. The government proposes to revise in a centralized manner prices for producer goods while setting prices for consumer goods free. Such a restructuring of pricing would not accomplish anything—either equilibrium prices or the leveling of disproportions—even under more favorable conditions than ours. However, I will repeat that the main miscalculation of the program proposed is in the government intending to begin with transformations which in the current environment are doomed to failure. The first steps of a radical reform should be completely different.

[Telen] Do you have proposals to make?

[Petrakov] Yes, and I have already stated them in the press. I am convinced that we should begin by demonopolizing the market and invigorating our financial system. There is no other way.

[Telen] That is, first of all we need a program for privatizing property?

[Petrakov] I would call it a program for the withdrawal of the state. Incidentally, I believe that this program should be primarily implemented from the top, through a purposeful state policy. The state should finally take the side of the customer and defend his interests.

At present, we have competition among customers. This is a typical model of the economy of shortages, economy of lines. It should be replaced by the competition of producers, their rivalry, and their struggle for the customer's ruble.

[Telen] What should the new economy be, as you see it?

[Petrakov] First of all, we should switch our state industry over to joint-stock forms of ownership. The state itself, banks, cooperatives, and, of course, private individuals may be shareholders. I am convinced that in the process enterprise shares may and should be sold not only to labor collectives but outside them as well. Otherwise, we will not have a securities market which ensures in a timely manner the transfer of capital to the most progressive and efficient sectors of the economy. The joint-stock format will be helpful in attracting

foreign capital by solving many problems of joint enterprises. Incidentally, foreign capital all by itself will make it possible to develop competition among the producers very quickly.

[Telen] Have you already been accused of proposing to sell off the motherland? Recently, representatives of some public organizations have allowed no such proposal to go unnoticed, charging that scientists, politicians, and essayists lack national pride....

[Petrakov] This is to say that when we stand in lines for imported clothing, our pride is fine, it is not wounded. However, it turns out that it would be if a foreign entrepreneur sets up the production of exactly the same goods in our country. Outstanding logic!

[Telen] So, we are looking at joint-stock companies, foreign and joint enterprises. What else?

[Petrakov] Small businesses. The state should give loans to all who want to engage in free enterprise. On top of it, it is worthwhile to grant tax relief to small enterprises.... This program of state withdrawal from ownership would also solve a number of other complex problems. For example, it will be easier to restructure our entire investment policy and decentralize it through shares. The state should retain only the financing of major social programs, basic scientific research, space.... Finally, the main point: By beginning with the buyout of production, we will control the financial crisis to a considerable degree. Invigoration of the ruble is one more priority task.

[Telen] Do you think that measures taken in order to reinforce the finance system have not brought results yet?

[Petrakov] What kind of results can we have when emission continues to grow, as well as, incidentally, unfinished production, and the amount of funds tied up in protracted construction projects and wages not backed by the delivery of goods. We continue to pay for useless work. Let us finally announce straightforwardly and openly: He who works poorly will earn little. To my mind, this is the only one of the so-called unpopular measures which will be understood by all strata of our society. Otherwise, the government will go on printing money in order to maintain workers who do not produce goods. Imagine that your neighbor upstairs forgot to turn off his faucet, and water is pouring down from your ceiling. To be sure, you could put a basin underneath, or mop up the water with a rag. However, first of all the faucet needs to be turned off. So, we still have not "turned off" our faucet.

[Telen] However, in the process we should look for ways to tie up the money already in circulation and that segment of it which puts pressure on the consumer market. It is hard to conceive of us purchasing, to say nothing of producing, R165 billion-worth of consumer goods.

[Petrakov] I think that it is impossible. I believe that this is why we need to look for ingenious ways to tie up this money. We need a market of dwellings, garden shacks, land.... Could you please explain to me why someone has decided that the people would not understand if some of the land were to be leased indefinitely with the right to inherit it? Would the people understand if the government were to raise prices in order to expropriate hot money?

We are timid and indecisive even regarding the steps we take. Say the people were offered an opportunity to buy their own dwellings; but does it make sense to do this when you can use apartments virtually free of charge? It is another matter if the state begins selling new dwellings vigorously. In this case, enterprises could underwrite some or even all of the cost of apartments for their employees. It should be paid from the financial incentives fund. Here is a real way for you to sharply reduce cash payments in the form of wages and bonuses.

I am very much alarmed by the position of our trade unions which come out sharply against commercial stores and auctions. I altogether fail to understand how the sale of diamonds or Toyotas at free-market prices hits common employees in the wallet. Moreover, I would propose to generally sell luxury items at regular free-market prices. This would both soak up some of the money and reduce panic. No revision of prices from the top solves these problems, as shown by the last revision of gold prices.

In a word, there is an extensive field for activity here, and far from all the opportunities have been taken advantage of. However, the solutions proposed trouble me. Here is a recent example: The government has issued so-called merchandise loans. Do you want to purchase a car, a VCR, or furniture out of turn? Go ahead, pay in the money, and in three years you will get the desired merchandise in short supply. Everything looks reasonable. However, it is clear right now that prices of these goods will be higher three years from now. What happens then? The government explains: "You will pay the difference."

[Telen] Really, this is a worthy reward for the magnanimous gesture of the citizens who are prepared to give the state an interest-free loan.

[Petrakov] Not only interest-free, but also sort of forgiving it for inflation! I do not think that the number of people who are prepared to give loans to the state at a loss to themselves is high right now.

[Telen] However, Nikolay Yakovlevich, can we seriously discuss invigorating the ruble given our current system of banks?

[Petrakov] Certainly we cannot. Reforms in this field cannot be postponed. We should switch to a two-tier system recognized throughout the world, with a state bank in the center and an extensive network of commercial banks. This is not just another repatterning of the

system based on a fashionable model. This is primarily a change in the functions of banks. All levers of steering the economy should go from ministers to bankers. The banks should also regulate investment flows.

[Telen] Under these new conditions, can the State Bank, which is responsible for emission, remain subordinated to the government?

[Petrakov] He who spends money should not print it. Only counterfeiters print and spend money at the same time. However, our money, in essence, is counterfeit, inferior money. It is just like a lottery ticket.... If the owner of the money gets lucky he may succeed in spending it....

[Telen] Nikolay Yakovlevich, we have referred to public opinion repeatedly today. It looks like a market economy indeed appears to be a virtual catastrophe to many of our citizens....

[Petrakov] Unfortunately, a certain mythical image of the market endowed with two main characteristics—high prices and windfall profits—has developed in our social consciousness. This is quite easy to explain: The people have never experienced a normal market, and they have developed, and are developing, their notions by observing shadow-economy operators. It is extremely difficult to explain that only the legalization of goods-and-money relations and their development will bring about a prosperous economy with flexible rather than high prices and with equal opportunities for all to make money in the field of free enterprise.

Here is one more peculiarity of our mass consciousness. We keep confusing economic issues with social ones. Say, the issue of enterprise bankruptcies is an issue of economic efficiency. The fate of a worker is an issue of social security which the state should guarantee by means of certain benefits, an opportunity to be retrained, or painlessly change one's place of residence. In our country, a situation when an employee is paid peanuts for producing worthless goods under atrocious conditions is considered more charitable. To my mind, this gives us neither social security nor an efficient economy.

[Telen] Still, no matter what view we take of these anomalies in public consciousness, we cannot ignore them in the course of restructuring the economy. Resistance by "the privates" may entail even worse consequences than the sabotage of economic "generals" which we observed when we tried to restructure ministries....

[Petrakov] This is why the economists unanimously came out against a number of government proposals, against shock treatment in the environment of our economy. Many interesting and, to my mind, fruitful proposals were made at the Presidential Council. I hope that the government will be able to use them in reworking its program. We expect a new version of it by mid-May.

'Convertible' Money Would Ease Market Switch

PM1506084590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 90 p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences P. Medvedev, by correspondent V. Medvedev under general heading "The Market: Possible Options"; date, place not specified]

[Text] **Money "Under the Mattress?" It Will Come In Handy, Doctor of Economic Sciences P. Medvedev Believes**

[V. Medvedev] Pavel Alekseyevich, you are known to be one of the authors of an alternative plan for the switch to the market. How does your option differ from the government plan?

[P. Medvedev] First, we took a long time to work it out and put a lot of thought into it. My colleagues I. Nit and V. Belkin and I published it in its original version back in 1986.

Second, quite obviously, there are dangerous features in N.I. Ryzhkov's report. The statement about price rises was sufficient to bring the country to the brink of catastrophe. But what will happen if prices really soar? And what is more, it is not certain that we will get a market in return.

Third, the government program does not contain any other mechanisms apart from central organ directives which would prevent prices from rising above a specified level.

Our proposal consists of the following: If an enterprise doubles its output sales (in physical terms, in items rather than money) raising prices by, say, 20 percent, and if this has been agreed in advance with the local authorities, everything will be fine as far as the enterprise is concerned. But if it increases prices by 25 percent, the local authorities will confiscate the five percent and impose a fine, to teach the enterprise a lesson.

This resolves a whole series of problems. Stagflation (inflation combined with a reduction in output) is ruled out. The population pays exactly as much as it is prepared to pay for market saturation, so as not to have to have recourse to speculators. The fines provide the local authorities with an additional source of income to compensate for the temporary reduction in real incomes.

The main objection we have to the government plan is its lack of a follow-through procedure.

[V. Medvedev] Is this a synonym for the "mechanism of implementation"?

[P. Medvedev] Yes, if you add the sequentiality of steps.

[V. Medvedev] Yet the government has also broken everything down into "stages"....

[P. Medvedev] What is needed is a gradual process; a leap is impermissible. If a law were to be published tomorrow closing down all ministries simultaneously, abolishing obligatory state orders, and introducing market relations, every rolling mill in the country will be faced with the choice: What next? Should it continue to roll metal in the profiles prescribed by the State Planning Committee and dispatch it along the same technological channels? Or should it look for actual clients? If it adopts the first course of action, the end product will again be tractors which no one needs. And if it adopts the second, it will end in nothing, because there is only one real client and that is the people. And they do not want rolled metal, they want food on their plate and clothes on their back. It takes time for the demand for food to be transformed into an order for steel. Therefore the "introduction of the market" is an impossible undertaking. It has to be phased in gradually.

[V. Medvedev] How?

[P. Medvedev] The most painless method of finding a sole equivalent for goods is not a reform on the lines of the 1961 reform but a switch to the population's money as the sole money. Why? For political reasons this money cannot be confiscated, and it is dangerous to allow its further devaluation. People are still prepared to work to acquire money.

The plan for basing the economy on the population's money is simple. The proceeds from the sale of goods to the population should be paid into a special account held by the producer. The enterprise is authorized to use the proceeds as it sees fit. After the compulsory payments have been made, any part of this money can be channeled into either purchase of production means, or payment of wages, or housing construction. We describe the money in these special accounts as convertible. It comes into circulation in strictly measured doses, only after the sale to the population of corresponding values. The first to switch to the new conditions of operation are those closest to the population, that is retail trade and consumer services. They will use part of their proceeds to pay allied enterprises. Subsequently the money from the free accounts will go to suppliers' suppliers and so forth. As appropriate for real money, this money will become the universal equivalent. This will help to create the conditions for the transition to wholesale trade in the means of production which are as yet lacking. This is to be followed by real economic accountability of enterprises, getting rid of money "under the mattress," reorientation toward new consumers, abolition of the state order, and the elimination of ministries.

[V. Medvedev] How long will this take?

[P. Medvedev] Four to five years, according to our estimates. But whereas the government is saying: You must be patient for a little while, the situation will get easier later, our plan will remove social tension from the outset. Whereas at present, every summer, we see trucks carrying tomatoes rejected by the trade outlets chasing from store to store, once convertible money has been introduced the stores will be unwilling to let a single carrot go.

[V. Medvedev] Do you hope for understanding (or at least attention) at union level, or are you pinning all your hopes on Russia?

[P. Medvedev] We are confident about Russia. As for the union level.... A week or so ago we were addressed by [USSR Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman] L. Abalkin. I asked him: Is it not time for us economists to sit down at a "roundtable"? "You know it is," he said with a sad look on his face. But so far he has not taken any steps or issued any invitations....

Conversion Poses Problems for Aircraft Industry

PM0806145190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by I. Mosin and A. Pokrovskiy under the rubric "At the Editorial Office 'Roundtable'": "Conversion Without Illusions"]

[Text] Conversion is not just an abstruse word. It is also a process that is very complex in terms of its profound essence. This became particularly clear during the debate on the concept of our country's switch to a regulated market economy. We gathered for a "roundtable" at the editorial office people who are very directly involved in it and who come into contact with all aspects of it in their own experience. The "roundtable" was chaired by V. Gubarev, editor of PRAVDA's scientific department.

From the Ministry's Viewpoint

"I wish to start from the premise that the main area of conversion in aircraft building, in our view, should be above all the intensification of work on creating engines for civil aviation," V. Chuyko, deputy minister of the aviation industry, opened our discussion. "The second area, also very important, is the use of gas-turbine drives for gas-pumping units, for power plants with very diverse applications such as extinguishing fires in mines or drilling wells, for mobile power stations, etc. At the same time it is expedient to make use of the high qualifications of our designers and industrialists in the development and manufacture of technically complex consumer goods and machines for light industry and the food industry.

"Now about the economic aspect of conversion, which does not seem to have been fully reckoned up. On the world market our basic output costs five to six times more in dollars than it does in our country in rubles [R]. So would it not be more expedient to increase its production and exchange the currency thereby obtained for consumer goods? And the same applies to machines for light industry and the food industry.

"Another comment. Today our civil aviation suffers from a shortage of aircraft engines. This is connected

with the fact that capacities for their repair are inadequately developed. There is also a shortage of new, more economical aircraft. It is in these areas that we see our chief tasks.

"Let us now take a look at this year's plan for our subsector. We plan to increase the production volumes for civil aviation engines by 9.1 percent, for consumer goods by 60 percent, machines for light industry and the food industry by 30 percent, and machines for the agrarian industry by 120 percent.

"One wonders whether the area for conversion has been chosen correctly since there are just four countries in the world today that can make a modern aviation engine to a high standard for any aircraft. And this means that this product is quite expensive on the world market. People pay millions of rubles for every engine. With this money we could acquire many goods and, more importantly, equipment for their production. But we are forced to apply the brakes to engine production."

"We also believe," V. Gorlov, deputy minister of civil aviation, said, "that conversion at the Rybinsk plant, for example, must be carried out entirely in this area. For approximately 150 of our engines have now been lying around there for several years. Production workers are not able to recondition them because of overloading at the plant, the poor production base, and the very large range of products, yet they have also been entrusted with making pasta production lines.

"Meanwhile 30 Il-62 aircraft, 15 Il-76's, and 40 Tu-154's are standing idle at civil aviation enterprises because of the lack of engines.

"I will remind you: last year Aeroflot carried 132 million passengers. According to our estimates, the unsatisfied demand amounted to more than 20 million passengers. The loss of live 'money,' as it were, totaled approximately R1 billion. The trouble is that civil aviation activity is still not actually regarded as a social service to the population for otherwise deliveries of civilian aircraft would be placed on the same footing as consumer goods production.

"Our civil aviation now lags considerably behind world standards. The Boeing 757 and 767 have been carrying passengers since 1982. The Il-96 and Tu-204, which are similar to them, will not be able to begin passenger operations before 1991. Why has this happened? Because for a long time the necessary attention was not devoted in the country to the development of civil aviation. You will recall that in the sixties and seventies we acquired the Il-18, An-10, Tu-104, Tu-134, Tu-114, An-24, and YaK-40. They were followed by the Il-62 and Tu-154. This was real conversion, although there was not so much talk of it. Then the government, relying on missiles in the matter of defense, set about reducing production of military aircraft. It was at that time that active use was made of the aircraft-building potential for the national economy. And good machines were created. But then came a long dip in the creation of civil aircraft."

From the Designers' Viewpoint

"On no account must the pace of leading research in aircraft building be slackened," D. Ogorodnikov, chief of the Central Institute of Aviation Motor Building, pointed out. "But our appropriations for science are being cut back sharply. We cannot now afford to run even our test beds, and a golden national asset is standing idle.

"This will result tomorrow in a drop in the reliability of our technology. Moreover, we have magnificent scientists whom we cannot now provide with either wages or appropriate equipment. And our specialists have been forced to turn to cooperatives.

"Because of this policy and the lack of centralized investment or concern for the experimental base, which must constantly be renewed, tomorrow we will end up reaping the same fruits in our as yet progressive sector as in very many sectors."

"Conversion began somewhat unusually for our association for the word was not even uttered," V. Kobchenko, general director of the "Soyuz" Science and Production Association, said. "To what we were doing for defense they added the manufacture of equipment for the starch hydrolysis industry.

"We would prefer them to remove a certain proportion of the military orders and give us an opportunity to find a consumer for our basic product. Aeroflot has a great need of aircraft for short-haul and local routes which require engines with a rating of 1,000-1,200 horsepower. We are interested in developing such engines, and we would use much of what we have accumulated prior to this. We could make power plants or compressor blades for the British Rolls-Royce engines used to pump gas. We have already found this ourselves because, when production capacities were freed, it was necessary to load them with something. But, as I have said, they gave us starch hydrolysis equipment.

"Such a switch to machines which in no way correspond to our design and production profile results in underloading of the experimental base, the specialized metallurgical production facility, and unique manufacturing processes like alloy spraying.

"At the same time, there is nearby—50 km from our design bureau—a science and production association for starch products which develops manufacturing processes for milling this starch. It has links with colleagues both in our country and abroad. It seems that when they handed out the targets in the process of conversion, they did not even take stock of the potential that already exists."

"Compared with last year, our budget funding this year amounted to 14.6 percent," N. Kuznetsov, general designer of Kuybyshev's "Trud" Science and Production Association, began his statement in a businesslike manner. "As a result of just three months of continuous strenuous work with the participation of the Ministry of

Civil Aviation, we have begun making a new-generation engine with very high economic efficiency.

"This is why my opinion is as follows: this conversion began in a very disorganized manner and this disorganization will yield grave fruits—we could lose cadres little by little and, most importantly, neglect scientific and technical groundwork.

"It is well known that the defense sectors were entrusted with helping the national economy back at the 25th CPSU Congress. At that time I happened to be at a borehole and I noticed that six diesel engines were working simultaneously to service it. This thought occurred to me: Could we not replace them with one, more powerful engine? It was then that we began developing an aviation-type engine for use in exploratory drilling, and later we used it to pump gas. In addition, the possibility emerged of using aviation engines which had come to the end of their lifetime on the wing. During the last five-year plan, the use of such engines saved approximately R4 billion. The entire Urengoy-Uzhgorod line and all northern stations are maintained by aviation engines and they pump practically all the North's gas.

"Speaking of conversion, we must seek continuity with regard to production, manufacturing processes, technical standards, and cadre qualifications. In addition, a feature of conversion is the fact that we in aviation are constantly attaining higher technical standards which means that we automatically ensure high standards also in the sector of the national economy where this equipment is used. We now have a projected variant of a 75,000-kilowatt power station based on aviation engines. It is such things, it seems to me, that we must undertake boldly despite the fact that there will be some limitations on our work. We have been entrusted, for example, with manufacturing a shredder of various kinds of foodstuffs. We are attempting to use processes of biotechnology, about which we understand nothing as yet, but we have to go into the specifics of it.

"It seems to me that the problem of conversion, if you consider it on a philosophical plane, is very important for you must not take each sector of industry in isolation but make the maximum use of what has been accumulated for the national economy in the neighboring sector. And of course, the special features of a sector like the aviation sector, for which the people and the state have paid dearly, can be utilized actively for the national economy."

"In our organization we deal with military engines," USSR People's Deputy A. Ryzhov, chief designer of the "Meteor" Science and Production Association, continued this theme. "Our volume has not fallen. But we have been loaded down with consumer goods, although we have inadequate capacities even to manufacture experimental engines.

"Therefore it seems to me that design bureaus should, all the same, be charged not with the series production of consumer goods but with their design development. What is more, it may be that what is needed here is not rigid targets but reliance on initiative. We ourselves will find something to do in the national economy, something we are capable of. Thus, for example, we are now making brick kilns over and above all plans. We know how to make gas burners and we are producing them. There are other developments too.

"In short, we have seen much here that can be applied in the national economy—previously we did not think of this. But no one finances such developments, you know. We have now been forced to do this with our own money by reducing the 13th-month bonus."

"We have traditionally developed engines for subsonic aircraft," F. Muravchenko, general designer of Zaporozhye's "Progress" Motor Design Bureau, said. "And in this sphere we have accumulated great experience in what is today being called conversion, i.e. the use of these engines for both military and civilian purposes. And now we know clearly that conversion starts with investment. You cannot take, let us say, a military engine in its pure form and install it on a civil aircraft, or vice versa. Financial investment, work, and time are needed here.

"Everyone knows the 'Druzhba' saw used to cut down the Soviet Union's forests. Well, this saw was developed by our special design bureau back in 1956. We have also made a device to extinguish fires in mines based on a gas-turbine engine. It meets world standards even today. We are now making compressor stations and oxygen- and nitrogen-extracting complexes. Why has all this not found wide consumption? Because everything was maintained only by enthusiasm. For this is something like a foreign body for the aviation industry."

"Our organization created the engine for the MiG-29 aircraft," A. Sarkisov, general designer of Leningrad's V. Klimov Science and Production Association, said. "We have recently been developing a motor for the Il-114 civil aircraft which, as you know, recently made its maiden flight. We have invested all the best in terms of ideas, technology, and materials in this aircraft. Our other progressive development is associated with the conversion of helicopter engines to gas. This is the future of aviation.

"Unfortunately, the loading of engine-building plants with consumer goods has resulted in not one enterprise making these promising motors for the time being. The basic product is gradually being ousted by consumer goods.

"Our association, for example, has been entrusted with creating footwear machines. Their range embraces approximately 200 units. All our troubles stem precisely from them. You see, they have to be better than the Italian and West German ones combined. I am obliged to give opinions of the newly created footwear machines' conformity with world standards. Although, frankly speaking, I hardly have the professional or moral right to do so.

"In order to create the new engine, we had to reduce consumer goods production by a factor of three. I withstood very great pressure from the Leningrad authorities in this regard. Nonetheless I held out and the aircraft flew. But series plants were not involved in producing engines since they are concerned with consumer goods. Before we have totally messed up the engine-building industry, we must decide in principle what to produce: either engines—for which purpose, strictly speaking, we were created—or shoes. Nothing good will come of this combination.

"Just think: ours is a standardized engine and is suitable for many aircraft. In addition, rivermen have taken an interest in it and our engine is a find for them. Is this not a consumer commodity too?

"Incidentally, there is another paradox. The Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry bought a license. And now a plant for the production of footwear machines is being built in Bashkiria. So why are we aviation engine builders wasting our efforts and brains on them?"

"I will attempt to look at the problem from another angle," V. Zazulov, chief designer of the "Temp" Aviation Design Bureau, said. "We are working on the creation of engine control systems. Since engine building is a high-technology area, it is naturally very costly. But if you look at what funds are allocated to the existence of design bureaus such as ours today, you will see that in practice we are able to buy just one machine tool a year with digital program control. And approximately 35 percent of our equipment was produced before 1940. At the same time, in order to improve engines, it is necessary to raise the technical standard of their control systems. Conversion has merely exacerbated this contradiction.

"Moreover, a simply incredible situation is taking shape in connection with conversion. Our control systems are small devices up to 700-800 mm in size. But within the framework of consumer goods production we have been entrusted with developing a packaging machine 12 meters 'high.' Where is it to be assembled? Not to mention how it is to be made. The plant is simply not adapted physically for resolving such problems. It is totally incomprehensible what principles were used to determine who should do what within the framework of conversion.

"At the same time the 'Engine Building-90' exhibition revealed extremely great interest in our systems on the part of other sectors of industry. We could make control systems of various classes for machine tools with digital program control, motor vehicles, and manufacturing lines. So maybe we should not deal in packaging machines that are unknown to us, but do our own thing?

"I think with bitterness of how many times we have already stumbled on this path and repeated our old mistakes over again. Questions of the conversion of the military-industrial complex are a problem of tremendous significance for the whole country. But, to the accompaniment of talk of new management methods and independence, we are once again tackling it in the usual, willful manner."

"Practically all the materials flying in the air were developed at our institute," R. Shalin, general director of the All-Union Aviation Materials Institute, pointed out with understandable pride. "But, unfortunately, little use is made of them in the national economy. We organized an exhibition of our innovations and representatives of 17 ministries passed through it. Let them see who needs what. Then we drew up an entire program of their utilization under the name 'Gorizont-95.' In it we specifically indicated where our materials can be used. According to specialists' estimates, its cost recovery in the very first year should amount to R600 million. We have concluded contracts for the use of our developments with every ministry and enterprise.

"But our materials are expensive and, naturally, not everyone can afford them. They evidently have to be used in limited numbers for the time being, for example in those products that promise the greatest saving. Take automobile pistons, for example. If made from our materials they will last several times longer, but this is if people act intelligently, as it were.

"In our case, conversion is developing into something strange. They have simply reduced our finance and advised us to earmark our materials for civil aviation.

"But our institute's strength is its basic research. New materials emerge on the basis of it. It is known that finance is needed in order to create scientific groundwork. But today we are allocated just...14 percent of the funds needed for scientific research work. Many ministries will agree to allocate money, but for specific work. And there is no funding for fundamental, basic subjects. Therefore, in my view it is extremely important to create major state programs defining the development of science and technology. And the state must finance them. We do not yet have organizations capable of investing large sums in basic work and I do not think they will appear soon. But without this work we deprive ourselves of our future."

"It seems to us that conversion was not properly thought out," O. Fatkulin, deputy chief of the All-Union Light Alloys Institute, supported the other speakers. "Was there such a program at all? To all appearances, the question of conversion has been tackled in a willful manner. What has conversion amounted to, for example, for our institute? They simply reduced our production volumes by almost 25 percent. The problem arose of making up the missing volumes of finance with the help of economic contracts. In the struggle to survive we lost sight of basic work. In short, the very real convulsions of conversion are now to be observed.

"We fear that no one will finance creation and the search for new materials. At the same time there are growing

demands on engine materials. In the drive for instant solutions there is a real danger of being left without a future."

From the Production Workers' Viewpoint

"To some extent we were prepared for conversion," I. Shitarev, general director of Kuybyshev's M.V. Frunze Motor-Building Production Association, opened a new part of our discussion with his statement. "Back in the seventies we began producing series engines for gas-pumping units. When production of our basic product was reduced, we simply increased production of these engines and thereby maintained the production volumes, the collective, and the technology.

"Today we are working actively on becoming participants in the program to produce power drives for gas industry workers. We see this as our future. Incidentally, the gas-pumping units have made such a good name for themselves that we now supply them to Argentina. In the long term we are promised a contract to supply up to 50 such machines a year over five years. This is a very profitable deal. The currency gained can then be used to develop production. In short, we have our work cut out. Last year we produced such goods to the value of R26 million. They include the celebrated 'Vikhr' boat motor. People abroad also buy it with pleasure.

"But once again complexities arise here. The following task is set today—you make 30,000 motors so tomorrow you will start making 75,000. But you cannot make something from nothing. In order to attain this level, it is necessary to at least replace the equipment with more productive equipment. How many millions of rubles are needed to buy it? Who will provide them? Second, it is necessary to find new people. We have neither today. No, they pressure us: conversion means you make 2.5 times more than you were making yesterday. In the final analysis this will not end well. It is, after all, time to grant enterprises independence and the opportunity to manage their own output not only on paper.

"This year we are starting to make sieves for starch. This even sounds strange, since we have been producing aviation engines since 1912. And then they suddenly decided to reprofile the association. Today we have a standard that took us decades to attain, and we have specialists who are able to make engines of any class. And alongside we are to begin this production of sieves for starches! No one wants to work there, and people have to be driven by force because they are paid kopeks there and the labor intensiveness is preposterous. There is neither mechanization nor automation, and everything has to be manufactured from scratch, on your knee. How can we make a good-quality product under the lash?

"I believe that it is time to speak directly and honestly at the top of our voice about the situation that has come about with conversion. We must build specialized plants for the production of consumer goods with high labor productivity. If we go on turning out nonspecialized components in aviation plants, a disaster will not be far off. A very responsible comrade saw how cogwheels are made for a high-precision aircraft engines and said: 'You know, I will not accept engines from you or give you a certificate for this production.' He was right. Is it really possible to prepare components for aviation engines and national economic output on the very same machine tools? But we have no other capacities!"

"We work mainly along military lines," G. Yazov, general director of Moscow's "Salyut" Production Association, said. "We have been joined by two plants. First we had to help them make components. This year we will produce pelt-fleshing and splitting machines and conveyor belts in them. But the whole point is that these machines are old and varied. They are something like 15-20 years old. We have modernized some of them, but finance is also needed to modernize the rest. Where is it to be found? In 1989 we went over to economic accountability and we can no longer invest any money. They work all the time on subsidies and are essentially loss-making.

"This is what I believe: since we are given a state order they ought to provide us with complete sets of equipment and materials for it. But now there is a state order and nothing for it."

"One of the pluses of conversion," B. Karasev, chief of the Scientific Research Institute of Technology and Production Organization, believes, "is that many institutes have now been opened. And many interesting developments have been made there which the national economy undoubtedly needs. We, for example, can name among them laser complexes for perforating cut-out products and pulsed electrochemical machining of components. Our institute has presented more than 120 developments at the National Economic Achievements Exhibition. We have even prepared a document in which we noted in detail what we can do for the national economy.

"Within the framework of conversion 12 plants have been transferred to our subsector. We have been entrusted with retooling them. This is an extremely complex task since the plants have been very neglected. We are seeing some machines for the first time. I believe that problems on such a scale should be resolved with the help of specialized production. It is impossible, physically impossible to make modern equipment for this whole economy out of nothing. For we are specialists in totally different areas. Imagine, the institute has been entrusted with reequipping a factory to package oat flakes. What is it like? A five-story building with a production capacity of 180 tonnes a day!

"Not only do we have to design these lines and automatic packing machines, but we must also manufacture them in metal and commission them. The task requires such an effort that we have to neglect our own basic work and deal with oat flakes. Maybe it would make more sense to give these plants not to us but to joint ventures,

cooperatives, or business people; introduce preferential taxes for them; give credits; and, in short, employ economic methods."

From the editors: This discussion about conversion leaves an alarming impression, does it not? For the umpteenth time we are paying for the "iron curtain" which for many decades hermetically separated advanced science and the defense sectors' progressive technologies from the entire national economy. And for the umpteenth time we are seeing an attempt to resolve this problem by using the same old edict-administrative methods that have been condemned repeatedly. The meeting participants are unanimous in the opinion that little will be done by means of strong-arm methods and the appeals "Let us" and "You must." Unfortunately, there is still no scientifically substantiated conversion program channeling the great potential of enterprises into creating complex products that the population needs and that are competitive abroad. The sector still does not know how to actively "trade" its engineering intellect and technological ability or make a profit even in the badly devastated consumer goods market, thereby protecting its unique cadres. It does not know how, or it does not have the opportunity? This question is inseparable from the whole economic situation in the country.

Lease Contract System Boosts Coalfield Output

PM1306091790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 8 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by N. Chirkov, V. Voronov from Raspadskaya coalmine on operation under leasehold conditions]

[Text] [Newscaster] In my opinion no other topic is attracting as much attention at the moment as the transition to market relations. Views differ widely, some people believe that it is a path which leads to the renewal of socialism, others that it is the road toward capitalism. The Raspadskaya mine, the country's biggest coal mining enterprise, has been operating under leasehold conditions for the past five months.

[Correspondent] USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry bulletins now feature the mine's indicators separately, to enable everyone, supporters as well as opponents of a leasehold economy, to follow the first steps of the fledgling leaseholder. [video shows various shots of mine]

A movement to achieve yields of 1 million tonnes of coal and more per year per coalface has been launched here. It is painful to remember, but in order to conclude a leasehold contract with the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, the mine had to appeal to the state arbitration service. The miners won the case and the contract was signed shortly afterward. However, even today the mine still has a long way to go to obtain the most favorable conditions for its operation from its former partners.

Since the beginning of the year Raspadskaya miners have extracted some 270,000 tonnes of coal in excess of the plan, and built up a substantial reserve in the construction of mine workings, which, as is well known, is a precondition of a good performance on the part of mining teams.

[A.Ye. Yevtushenko, cochairman of leaseholders council, identified by caption] Talking about our first results, we regard the increased coal production and higher per capita income as less important than the fact that we have managed to conclude direct contract relations with the Coal Marketing Administration [uglesbyt] and with coal consumers. We are trying to obtain an increase in coal prices. That is to say, we, ourselves, are beginning to build the market relations which are absolutely indispensable in our country.

[Correspondent] There are factors which are of particular concern to leaseholders—higher labor productivity and lower prime cost. As is known, it was at Raspadskaya mine in the team of USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy Vladimir Gvozdev that a simple initiative was launched which is highly appropriate in market conditions—to double labor productivity in comparison with the last five-year plan. [video shows smiling miners in front of operating coal conveyor] This is of utmost importance in obtaining revenue in conditions of economic accountability. At the moment the miners are mastering new mining techniques. Without an increase in staffing, the team is extracting coal simultaneously from three seams. This is unprecedented in the practice of coal mining. It requires not only professional skill on the part of engineers and workers but also a high level of organization and discipline. And the performance reports confirm this. Whereas in February, when the leasehold contract was signed, production per miner per month was 1,120 tonnes of coal, it is now almost five freight cars more.

[A.Ye. Yevtushenko] It is perfectly obvious to us that what matters most today is not merely signing a contract and obtaining the first results, even if they are very good results, but instilling in every worker, every member of the labor collective, the new thinking which is indispensable in conditions of the country's and the sector's transition to market conditions. This is no mean task.

[Newscaster] I fully agree with Comrade Yevtushenko when he says that the main thing now is to instill in every worker the new thinking, a new attitude toward the market. Today leasehold conditions are being sought in timber industry sectors and also by 30,000 employees of the Baltic Shipping Line, trade personnel at most stores, and agricultural workers. However, many people simply do not know what leasing means. Furthermore, past experience advises caution both in respect of leasing and the market. Social tensions within society have reached such a pitch that it is necessary to proceed in an economically substantiated fashion and in earnest. It is necessary to explain to people honestly what the market will bring, by how much living standards are likely to deteriorate, by how much unemployment will go up, and what measures will be adopted to protect people.

Objection to Vyborg Enterprise Zone Voiced

904A0407A Moscow TRUD in Russian 7 Jun 90 p 2

[Article by D. Struzhentsov: "The 'Zone' (Can We Sacrifice a National Treasure For the Sake of Hard Currency?)"]

[Text] During the wonderful period of the white nights I was lucky enough to spend several days at the recreation center of the "Elektrik" plant in Leningrad. There was an endless chain of lakes framed by pine forests or fir groves full of thick underbrush; huge boulders were scattered around the shores as if at someone's whim. On a quiet and clear evening I was talking to center manager A. Kalyakin about the beauty of this area, which has not yet been transformed by man into "the environment." We also talked about the future of the center.

"Before the revolution one of the richest men in Russia—Rodzyanko—had his estate not far from here," Andrey Nikitovich told me. "I do not think the choice was accidental because there is no other place like this. Maybe I am laying it on too thick, but really there are very few such picturesque places in our north, especially where the water is clear and the air is not polluted."

"You must have a lot of plans—so many more things can be done here."

"If only we could," said the manager with a sigh. "They say that we are going to be moved out of here and they will set this up as the Vyborg free enterprise zone."

A zone—the word itself grates on your ears, so unpleasant does it seem. A no trespassing zone, a labor camp zone, a contamination zone, and now we have a free enterprise zone. But semantics is not the problem. I just do not have enough imagination to apply the word to the beauty of the white nights on the Karelian isthmus, to the wild screams of the seagulls, or to the springtime song of the nightingales.

But the zone has already become a reality. The Leningrad Oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] engineering center has already opened "Inteks"—the center's branch in Vyborg, which is drafting the plans. An association of enterprises for the development of the zone has been formed. Things are moving. They are moving in spite of the unambiguous statement of the Leningrad Committee For the Protection of Nature: "The Committee For the Protection of Nature of Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast considers that the creation of a zone on the territory in question cannot be allowed. The ecology of Vyborgskiy Rayon territory has not been sufficiently researched."

But there is no time to conduct research; there is no time even to discuss the problem. The country needs hard currency. As early as 20 September 1989 the official organ of the Soviet power—the newspaper IZVESTIYA—informed us: "Three free economic zones will be set up in the USSR, probably as soon as the coming year. According to the announcement made at a 14 September press conference by I. Ivanov, deputy chairman of the state foreign economic commission of the USSR Council of Ministers, the Soviet Government made a fundamental decision in this respect. The first free joint enterprise zones will be set up in the areas of Vyborg, Novgorod, and Nakhodka. The majority of the population of these cities supported the proposals made by the local authorities about such a novel way to develop."

There you are: They supported it! Even though the first dialogue between officials and the people of Vyborg took place only in late November. It is still a mystery how the Council of Ministers managed to learn the opinion of the "majority of the population." No referendum or any serious opinion poll was conducted in Vyborg.

This, however, did not prevent the Vyborg "Inteks" branch from drafting an official concept for the creation of the zone. They also hurried to publish it last February as material for discussion in the newspaper VYBORGSKIY KOMMUNIST. At the very beginning this document states the following: "It is suggested to designate the entire Vyborgskiy Rayon as the joint enterprise zone and to limit Soviet citizens in their access to the territory of Vyborg and the rayon." Are they going to install border checkpoints here? It is true that A. Gruzinov, deputy chief of the Leningrad Oblispolkom foreign economic relations department, is absolutely against any limitations on the right of the Soviet citizens to enter the zone. According to him, the executive committee never meant to close the zone to entry. But then we cannot understand how it was possible for a specially created oblispolkom group to draft a concept that deals with the problem quite unequivocally: "No entry!" What will Leningraders do?

For more than five million Leningraders the area of the Karelian isthmus and Vyborgskiy Rayon always served as a traditional recreation area. This is the place where enormous plants and factories that employ many thousands of workers have their recreation centers. Among these plants and associations are the "Izhorskiy zavod," the "Elektrosila," the "Elektrik," the "Admiralteyskoye obyedineniye," etc. It is the location of dozens of preventive treatment clinics and hundreds of young pioneers' camps. Will they now have to be surrounded by barbed wire? Vasiliy Ivanovich Borisov, the leader of the "Inteks" group which is immediately involved in the zone concept design, gave a complete answer to the question. Without batting an eye, as they say, he declared: "Eventually all these institutions will have to be removed from the zone."

It seems that A. Kalyakin had good reasons to be worried. The idea of "barbed wire" around Vyborgskiy Rayon sounds quite serious. But to me it is nothing but a crime to take away from Leningraders their wonderful areas of recreation, sports, and tourism. I cannot find another name for this than crime. Can it be true that we are ready to sacrifice the health of millions of people for hard currency profits?

The first stage of the "action" should incorporate the already functioning enterprises by increasing their production capacities and changing their production types to those requiring larger scientific research. But it is obvious to anyone that there is no reason to create a special zone with only this in mind—the number of enterprises there is rather limited. And after they incorporate the existing plants, they will start to build new ones; they have already started to do this, to expand the industrial area. But the entire Karelian isthmus is only about 15 square kilometers! But what kilometers! In the singular beauty of its landscapes, in its unique flora and fauna, it can be compared to the Crimean peninsula, to the Black Sea coast of the Caucasus, or to the Riga gulf shores.

A normal thinking person would not even dream of making these natural parks an industrial zone, but they want to do it to the Karelian isthmus. This decision can be qualified as blasphemous as the idea to build the infamous dam in the Gulf of Finland which caused the "ecological blockade" of Leningrad, or may be compared to the decisions that helped to kill the Aral Sea.

Both in the Leningrad Oblispolkom and in Vyborg they tried to convince me that nobody should feel any concern for nature as they are solely going to build ecologically safe enterprises. I would be happy to believe in this pleasant tale if not for some provisions of the concept draft. For instance, here is what should happen if a foreign lease-holder damages the environment: "A compensation in a convertible hard currency will be paid for any damage. The compensation will be computed according to the methods used in the USSR."

We know only too well what these "methods" are. According to these very methods Leningrad industries regularly pollute the Neva, the Ladoga, the Gulf of Finland, and the air above us with their emissions for which they pay puny fines. Judging by the Vyborg "concept," foreign lease-holders will be allowed to do the same. They can fell trees and contaminate rivers as long as they pay hard currency for all of it.

Even if we believe in something totally improbable—that they will not build a single new plant but only intensify usage of the existing industries—still the damage to nature cannot be avoided. The reason is that the negative effect of the economy on the above-mentioned protected lands is already increasing.

It would be appropriate to mention here that the Karelian isthmus subsoil waters run rather close to the surface; there is not enough of them and they cannot be used for the centralized water system of the zone. The water-bearing stratum is not protected from surface contamination and is inevitably damaged by any digging. But that would not stop anyone if profits come in the form of hard currency. Therefore the "concept" states: "Organizations should be started and expanded on the territory of Vyborgskiy Rayon to utilize the areas designated for the industrial construction." In other words, a large-scale offensive against nature is beginning.

"Our wish is that in the near future our first national park will be the pride of Leningraders," the Leningrad young people's newspaper SMENA wrote about the Karelian isthmus in 1984. Today they stay bashfully silent about the national park. They talk more about the joint enterprise zone. However, it is important to create such a park not only because a unique area like this badly needs protection. It is important also because the Karelian isthmus is a sort of a link in the chain of nature sanctuaries along the coast of the Gulf of Finland. The chain starts by Lahemaa Park near Tallinn, next comes the Kotelskiy botanical preserve, then the Karelian isthmus, after it the Imyaynen National Park in Finland, and the preserves around the Kotlin and Helsinki industrial centers. Nobody builds factories on the territory of these parks and preserves, nobody fells trees there; instead they set up recreation facilities, organize hunters' and fishermen's centers, assign places for collecting berries and mushrooms. And what do we have—a zone?

An industrial zone or a park? This is the current question and it cannot marry the two notions. I am sure that the majority of Leningraders are for the park. The trouble is that nobody wants to know their opinion.

From the editor: It is unreasonable, to say the least, to deny the common sense behind the creation of free enterprise zones. International integration is the shortest and surest road toward an improved economy in the entire county. We have the raw materials, the land, the working hands, and the scientific research. We need the technologies, the experience, and the investments. All this we can get through the free enterprise. The only problem we have is that of finding locations for such zones. And this complex problem can only be resolved when, apart from considering the proximity of the border and the existence of already functioning plants, we also start thinking of the people's recreation and their opinions, trying not to worsen the already bad ecological situation.

Publisher Rebuts Paper Shortage Criticism

WA0106190390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 May 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by V. Romnyuk: "Glasnost Held Captive by Shortages or Again on the Paper Syndrome"]

[Text] The editor in chief of NOVYY MIR, S. Zalygin, heaped harsh criticism on the Izvestiya Publishing House from the pages of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. The subscribers have noted: The magazine comes out very late; May is already half over and many people have not received their March or even February issues. S. Zalygin called this situation which has developed with the magazine's publication a separation from the country's social and literary life. Strong words! Of course if the material is published late it may be less timely. So up to this point they still have not published 200,000 copies

of the first issue for 1990, 700,000 of the second, and of the third they have only printed 1 million copies (of the circulation of 2.7 million).

But here is what is perplexing: The Izvestiya Publishing House is almost accusing people of sabotage. They say the publishers are stingy. The magazine brings them tens of millions of rubles in profit and the publishing house does not want to spend even a part of this money to acquire paper on the commercial market (if there were any!) and does not even consider it necessary to retain a certain worker who would constantly check to make sure that the magazine goes into production. Further, the editorial remark says literally the following: "If the Izvestiya Publishing House does not fulfill its duty to NOVYY MIR this will mean nothing other than a flouting of the principle of glasnost and the crudest challenge to the process of democratization of our society."

Here is what the deputy director of the Izvestiya Publishing House, D. Plesser, has to say about this:

"The magazine's circulation was set at 1.7 million copies—with an increase of 150,000. Then the subscription was extended for a month. And then there was a leap—by an entire million! Why? The editorial board, having no material base, promised its readers a seven-volume edition of A. Solzhenitsyn as an appendix. In essence the readers were deceived. But the deal had been made: The circulation jumped by a million, and this is an additional 5,000 tons of newsprint.

To give everything to NOVYY MIR in the current situation would mean to take it away from other publications that are experiencing no fewer difficulties and have equal rights to reach their readers. Glasnost cannot be selective. And what can the publishing house provide today? To get down to brass tacks, the problem of NOVYY MIR was largely created...by the editorial board of NOVYY MIR.

Indeed something can be purchased on the market, but who will pay for it? The state price per ton is R23 and the market price—R3,000. And the demand of the Izvestiya Publishing House for newsprint as a whole (this also includes book-journal products) is satisfied by only 70 percent. They have allotted 500 tons from the state reserves of the USSR Council of Ministers but this is just a drop in the bucket.

And what do we have in Izvestiya? No official responses followed after the publication of the article "The Paper Syndrome" (No. 325 for 1989). The head of the paper department of Izvestiya Publishing House, S. Pekh, reported that this year the combine had been allotted 5,000 tons less than it needed. This does not seem like a lot. But the fact is that it is not so simple to obtain the volumes allotted by the USSR Gosplan. In the first place the pulp and paper combine will not accept the full volume of state orders for fulfillment, blaming the completely worn-out equipment and also the lack of raw material. In the second place, there is some question about the delivery of 25,000 tons of Finnish paper, since the government has no hard currency. (In five months only 3,000 tons have been received.)

The basic problems for Izvestiya will begin later. But even now they are printing only the number of copies that go to the subscribers. In Moscow, for example, you will not find IZVESTIYA for sale. And the increase in reader demand—in five months the circulation of IZVESTIYA has increased by 500,000 copies—gathers up all the crumbs that are tossed into retail trade. Certain publications have simply become hostages to their own popularity. The newspaper TRUD, having received an additional circulation of 1.5 million copies in five months, has created a deficit of 9,000 tons of newsprint. The Sunday supplement NEDELYA lost more than a million copies to be sold to retail trade. The weeklies SEMYA and SOYUZ are also printed by subscription only—they do not go into retail trade at all. It is especially difficult for the new weekly SOYUZ: Without retail trade many new readers simply cannot get an idea of what the new publication is like.

I will tell you honestly: I am tired of all these statements about the paper shortage. Glasnost is glasnost, but it is not only the growing circulation of popular publications that explains the aggravated shortage. The chief of the department of balances and wholesale trade in pulp and paper products of the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], I. Kharitonov, throws up his hands: The USSR Gosplan allots them and we merely assign them. And, judging from everything, even that is only on paper. We ask the publishing houses to be more active in solving the paper problem, concludes Ivan Semenovich.

But what does that mean in practice? That the leaders of the publishing houses run around to the combines gathering up crumbs and manage to have the state order increased from 95 to 98 percent. More and more frequently it is necessary to "bow before the ruble." For example, the Izvestiya Publishing House invested 4.5 million rubles in the development of the Balakhna pulp and paper combine, and for this it gets a guarantee that the combine will keep the agreements it has concluded. Now they are investing 1.5 million rubles in the economy of Kondopoga. This enterprise is also promising to fulfill its commitments. It turns out to be something like a bonus for discipline.

A contract with an Austrian firm for purchasing another enterprise for producing newsprint is in the discussion stage. It would seem that things will reach a point where the largest publishing houses will sharply expand the sphere of their activity and switch to the category of concerns that include the entire cycle—from the production of paper to the output of newspapers and magazines. The USSR Gossnab, as I understand it, is completely happy with this variant. At the same time I. Kharitonov asked me to do everything I can to oppose attempts to create a free paper market in the country. His arguments: The less well-off clients will suffer, for instance, the

Prosveshcheniye publishing house, which produces inexpensive textbooks. In I. Kharitonov's opinion, a paper market should not be created until the deficit is less critical. Now there are only half enough resources to cover the real demand.

But really, a free market already exists, although it is still a "shadow" market. Various kinds of publications see the light of day, including those of doubtful merit. Paper for printing them is not allotted officially, which means it is bought second-hand from the departments which are now crying about their problems. If a certain proportion of the paper goes into the free market the prices, of course, will rise, but the extra income that comes because of this can be used for technical retooling of the branch. "The culture suffers," they complain in the USSR Gossnab. But this department's distribution philosophy is well known: The more critical the shortage, the more justified the dictatorship.

But what does the USSR Gosplan think about this? I asked the deputy chief of the subdivision for balances and plans for distribution of products from the pulp and paper industry of the USSR Gosplan, I. Kostrikov, to clarify the situation:

"Why is a deficit deliberately planned? In keeping with a decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet," Igor Ivanovich says with a certain amount of irony. "Since now the state order cannot be established in the volume of 100 percent, it is assigned to pulp and paper combines in a volume of 95 percent. This means that 92,000 tons of newsprint are removed from the direct agreement. And another 50,000 tons of paper for the press have been taken out of the state order. It would seem that there is nothing strange here—the paper goes into the free market where it can be bought at a higher price. But no, the paper manufacturers intended to place these volumes of paper on the world market in order to earn hard currency. And this is under the conditions of our critical shortage!"

What do you say to this? The labor collectives have this right; it is written into the law on the state enterprise. And the paper manufacturers do not need the hard currency to buy Mercedes or sheepskin coats but to modernize worn-out equipment and to buy spare parts for paper manufacturing machines purchased from foreign firms previously. Incidentally, under the pretext that the technical equipment is completely worn out the paper manufacturers achieve a further reduction of the "quotas" of the state order which, in their opinion, are too high. Kondopoga, for example, exchanges paper for sugar and groceries, and it partially justifies the exporting of the snow-white rolls of paper by saying that when it has its own hard currency it has the opportunity to buy spare parts for the paper manufacturing machines.

While the debates are going on in various departments, the alarm in the publishing houses is growing: What will happen to the circulation, to the subscribers, to glasnost in general! Rapid and fairly radical solutions are required here. It is necessary to find hard currency resources to buy back that part of the paper that is already making its way abroad. Then the pulp and paper combines will receive the hard currency they want and, perhaps, will not insist on lowering the level of the state order. So far there is no solution and the publishing houses are being forced to give certain newspapers and magazines reduced volumes and to cut circulation.

But book publishing suffers most of all from the paper shortage. For example, the State Committee for the Press is not provided with paper for 15 percent of its output—and this is about 20,000 tons. For comparison let us say that it takes 22 tons of paper for a book in an edition of 100,000 copies with 10 printers' sheets. So after the textbooks are published it is necessary to cut some of the titles and editions. Then there are also the difficulties of the periodical magazines. RABOTNITSA and KRESTYANKA which have large circulations take paper with a smoother surface. It is bought for hard currency and there is nothing else they can do since the printing equipment is also designed for this kind of paper.

This is not the first time we have had occasion to speak about departmental theft of significant resources of paper. The departments are now receiving 117,000 tons of newsprint and they have to fight tooth and nail for that. Of this amount 40,000 tons are used for waybills. But still the rest of it is used for various kinds of departmental items which do nothing other than serve to enhance the reputation of their own department.

And another problem. Even if they accept the state orders, the pulp and paper combines try to put off the main volumes until the end of the year without being especially concerned about the consumers. But newspapers and magazines are published with a certain rhythm and it is impossible to put off certain issues to the end of the month or quarter.

Well, frankly, we must radically change our attitude toward the branch that is working for glasnost. And until it is back on its feet, possibly, we should revise the procedure for forming the circulation of publications: In the current situation we should proceed not only from the readers' tastes but also from the initial paper resources and what we can do with the hard currency we have available.

Agricultural

Chicken Farmers' Increased Production Praised

PM1406144990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Vidonov video report from Bratsk poultry unit]

[Text] [Announcer] The form of the next report reminds me of a report from the seventies. But that apart, the main thing is that what we have is an optimistic forecast of the solution of Bratsk's food problems.

[Video report showing inside of poultry unit] The northerners' demand for eggs is fully met. There are even problems selling them. Such are the laws of the saturated market. But the region is short of chicken meat. The Bratsk No. 1 broiler factory was constructed to fill the gap. It will raise 10 million broilers per year. But it will be five to seven years before that state of abundance is reached. That is a long time. So the Bratsk poultry workers have taken a new, speedier, more effective, and cheaper path—retooling of the existing production process, complete replacement of obsolete equipment that has been operating for over 30 years, a switch to new technology, and conversion of one-half of the capacities to the raising of broilers. There are problems, particularly with supplies of feed, materials, and equipment. No one can be relied on. They are looking for the solution themselves, seeking reliable, solid partners, concluding contracts with enterprises in the Far East, Astrakhan, and Stavropol Kray for the supply of mixed feed and protein additives. And the retooling has not cost the state a penny. At the beginning of the next five-year plan they will already be producing 4,000 tonnes of chicken meat, which is double the present amount. So the new area of economic activity chosen by the Bratsk poultry workers is the right one.

Late-May Weather, Crop Conditions Reported

904B0223A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 6 Jun 90 p 2

[Article by S. Malikova, agricultural meteorologist: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Cool weather was observed over the country's European territory during the last 10-day period. In the majority of regions the average air temperature was two to four degrees lower than the average annual temperature.

Rain, heavy for the most part, was observed everywhere. It created good conditions for the growth of stalks and satisfactory conditions for the blossoming of winter crops. The height of the winter wheat ranged from 70-100 cm in the stages of forming ears and blossoming and from 35-60 cm in the growth stage, and the corresponding heights for rye were 100-120 cm and 40-90 cm. An ear of wheat contained 17-20 spikelets and an ear of rye 28-32, which is close to the average annual quantity.

The cold weather was unfavorable for the growth and development of corn, the appearance and formation of shoots, and for the accumulation of plant mass. The sugar beet continued to grow roots and form leaves under conditions of the reduced temperatures. To the south of the territory the plants were observed making contact in the rows, and in Moldavia the plants closed up the spacing between the rows.

Flax continued to grow stalks over the whole flax-producing territory, was observed to be forming racemes in the early crops of the western oblasts of the Ukraine, and was blossoming in Rovno Oblast. To the south of the territory the sunflower was observed in the stage of forming racemes. Light frosts resulted in significant damage, and in places there was loss of transplanted seedlings of warm season crops and cucumber shoots.

Flowering of fruit crops ended in the northern regions, and south of the Riga-Mogilev-Ryazan-Kuybyshev line formation and growth of fruits continued. Damage and loss of blossoms and flower buds as well as shedding of ovaries were observed.

It was cool in the republics of the Transcaucasus during the first half of the 10-day period. Light frosts were observed at the soil surface in Armenia and parts of Georgia. It warmed up at the middle of the 10-day period. In Azerbaijan the wheat and barley showed milky ripeness, and in places the barley ripened. It was not warm enough for the cotton to grow and develop.

The weather was changeable in the agricultural regions of Western Siberia and the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan. The first days of the 10-day period were hottest, when the maximum air temperature was 27-33 degrees. Reduced temperatures, to the point of light frosts, were noted in the middle and at the end of the 10-day period. True, the average air temperature for the 10-day period was two to four degrees above the annual average.

The winter grain crops continued to grow stalks. The rye began to form ears in places in Semipalatinsk, North Kazakhstan, and Novosibirsk Oblasts and in Altay Kray. Conditions for the germination of seeds, the appearance of shoots, and the rooting of early spring grain crops were satisfactory and good. For the time being the reserves of usable moisture in the cultivable layers of soil are sufficient over most of the territory.

Mass shoots of sugar beet have appeared in Altay Kray at a time that is close to the annual average. Growth of its roots continued on the irrigable lands of Kazakhstan. The early sunflower crops were observed in the stage of the second pair of true leaves. Cereal grasses were forming ears, and the leguminous grasses began to form racemes. Aftergrowing of grasses continued in the northern regions.

The weather was changeable in the republics of Central Asia. The greatest amount of precipitation fell over Kirghizia and the north of Tajikistan. Over the rest of the territory precipitation either did not occur or was negligible.

Winter crops formed ears and flowered, and in the south of Uzbekistan and in Tajikistan they finished forming grain. Development of the third to the fifth leaf has been noted on the cotton in the majority of the sown areas, and flower buds have begun to form on the early crops.

In Andizhan Oblast the crops were damaged in places by downpours and hail.

Agricultural Developments for 7-13 June

LD1406010890

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 7-13 June, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

6-9 June

No significant developments reported.

10 June

There is an unusually protracted drought in the agricultural regions of Irkutsk Oblast. In the middle of May there was a tornado, which left destruction in its wake, in addition to soil baked by the heat. To date, of 1.2 million hectares of area sown, one-third has been effectively lost. The escalating losss are estimaed at 20 million rubles. (Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 11 Jun 90)

11 June

Hurricane-force winds and heavy hail have caused great suffering in two towns under rayon jurisdiction and in 20 settlements. Rye and corn crops, almost ripe enough for harvest, have been completely ruined. Hail has destroyed vegetable plantations. (1430)

12-13 June

No significant developments reported.

Scientific

'Molniya-3' Satellite Launched 13 Jun

LD1406065190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0603 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 14 June (TASS)—Another communications satellite Molniya-3 was launched on Wednesday in the Soviet Union from the Molniya rocket-carrier for the purposes of ensuring the operation of a long-distance telephone and telegraph radio communication system, the broadcast of USSR Central Television programs to points in the Orbita network, and international cooperation.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with an apogee of 40,839 km in the northern hemisphere and a perigee of 492 km in the southern hemisphere. The satellite's period of revolution is 12 hours and 18 minutes and its orbital inclination is 62.8 degrees.

Communication sessions via the Molniya-3 satellite will be carried out in accordance with the planned schedule.

Unique 'Lomonosov' Space Project Shelved

LD1406204390 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—The implementation of a unique space project, which could aid the work of astronomers for the next 50 years, has been shelved.

The project was not particularly expensive for a space programme. It would cost only R120 million and some 50 million U.S. dollars (if foreign investors are found).

"According to the project, which is named after the great Russian scientist Mikhail Lomonosov, it was planned to launch a Soviet space observatory between 1995-1996. The observatory was to create a high-precision coordinate system of the skies," Sternberg Astronomy Institute scientist Yevgeniy Sheffer said.

"The astronomic satellite would let astronomers create a common scale that could be far more precise than any existing one. Such a long-term coordinate system could be used for 30 to 50 years. It is badly needed in astrometry, geodynamics, geodesy and solar system studies.

"The financing of the project has been stopped. We are now trying to switch the project to a commercial basis. We suggested that scientists from Italy, West Germany and the European Space Agency participate in the joint research.

"Our proposal will be discussed at the congress of the Association of Space Explorers, due in the Netherlands in July. We were invited to the congress to acquaint its participants with the project," he said.

Disarmament Raised in UN Space Committee Meeting

LD1506091190 Moscow TASS in English 0820 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] United Nations June 15 TASS—The United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, which unites 53 nations, has concluded its 33rd session here.

Discussions at the session focused on ways to cooperate and find solutions. The committee discussed scientific, technical and legal aspects of the use of nuclear sources of energy in outer space, geostationary orbits, space transportation systems, the probing of the earth from satellites, and indirect advantages from the use of space technology.

The committee adopted by consensus recommendations for the preservation of outer space for peaceful purposes. Delegations from developing countries and the Soviet Union called for making the committee and the conference for disarmament mutually supplementary.

The United States and some other countries took a different stand, seeking to block discussion of disarmament issues by the committee. They claimed these issues were not within the committee's competence.

However, the Soviet delegation said the treaty on space, worked out by the committee in 1967, contained disarmament aspects. It bans the deployment of nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation in outer space.

The Soviet delegation reiterated its proposal to set up a world space organisation and to establish large-scale international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

The session's recommendations, which are to be considered by the UN political committee and submitted to the General Assembly, emphasise the need to extend the utilisation of space technology for the benefit of all mankind.

Kola Radiation Checks Rebut 'Cloud' Story

PM1306113590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Occasional (vneshtatnyy) correspondent A. Khramtsov dispatch: "But There Was No Cloud..."]

[Text] Murmansk, 12 Jun—In the West, a report has been circulated to the effect that a radioactive cloud has appeared above the Kola Peninsula and the Scandinavian countries, apparently formed as a result of a recent leak of rocket fuel in the waters of the White Sea.

In this connection, the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology gave instructions to the Murmansk Territorial Administration for Hydrometeorology to carry out frequent measurements of radiation. All 35 radiometric supervision centers on the Kola Peninsula started taking measurements every three hours. However, they did not detect any increases in the level of radiation either in the atmosphere or on the surface of the ground.

As A. Semenov, deputy chief of the Murmansk Territorial Administration for Hydrometeorology, reported, the radiation level has stayed within normal limits during these days—between 10 and 20 microroentgens an hour.

Analogous measurements have been carried out by specialists at the Kola nuclear power plant and the "Atomflot" service and supply enterprise supervision services, which did not detect an increased radiation level either.

Military

Defense Ministry Statement on Troop Reductions

LD1406165890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1557 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 14 June (TASS)—We convey the official statement of the USSR Ministry of Defense:

"The Soviet Union is consistently implementing the decision adopted unilaterally on reducing its Armed Forces. At the present time their number has decreased by 296,600 servicemen. The 13th Guards Division, withdrawn to the Soviet Union from the territory of Hungary, and the 32nd Guards and 25th Tank Divisions, withdrawn from the territory of the GDR, have been demobilized. Besides this, a number of airborne assault and assault crossing units and subunits, with the standard-issue weapons and hardware, have been withdrawn from groups of troops.

"In the course of bilateral Soviet-Czechoslovak and Soviet-Hungarian negotiations, accords have been reached on the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the CSFR and the Hungarian Republic. In 1991, in all, seven divisions, of which three are tank divisions, will be withdrawn. The withdrawal of troops from Czechoslovakia and Hungary considerably extends the scale of the unilateral reduction of the USSR Armed Forces.

"At the same time, it must be taken into account that a new military-strategic situation has arisen in Europe since the moment of the Soviet declaration on the unilateral withdrawal of six tank divisions from the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary and their subsequent demobilization. However, beyond this, acting in the spirit of M.S. Gorbachev's speech to the United Nations Organization of 7 December 1988, the Soviet Union has demobilized three more tank divisions in the European part of the USSR.

"Thus, as was envisaged, six tank divisions have been withdrawn from the ground troops and demobilized.

"On the agreement of the MPR [Mongolian People's Republic] government, the Soviet troops temporarily deployed there are also returning home."

MiG-27 Bombers Reported on Kola Peninsula

LD1406193990 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1800 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] The Soviet fighter bombers which left Debrecen recently have been deployed on the Kola Peninsula. This was announced by the Norwegian Defense Command, adding that the fighter bomber squadron's MiG-27-type planes also can be fitted with nuclear weapons. Thus they significantly increase the northern Soviet Air Force's attack capability. They stated in Oslo that earlier, Moscow used to station fighter bombers in the territory only during certain maneuvers.

Conference Examines Military Training Safety

PM1406152190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Our correspondent report: "Problem Discussed"]

[Text] Ensuring the safety of military labor. The policy of intensifying troops' combat training and the increased

intensity of utilizing motor transport are today moving this problem up the priority scale in the work of military councils, commanders, staffs, and political organs. Having discussed ways of resolving the problem, the participants in a conference held by the USSR Ministry of Defense and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate have drawn up a number of concrete measures aimed at improving the organization of the training process and creating conditions guaranteeing the safety of personnel when using equipment and arms and when carrying out construction and other work.

The keynote report by Lieutenant General V. Grebenyuk, deputy chief of the Main Political Directorate, and speeches by participants in the conference stressed that ensuring the safety of military labor is a most important element of the work to strengthen discipline and organization in the Army and Navy.

Army General K. Kochetov, USSR first deputy minister of defense, summed up the conference's results.

Defense Committee Views Forces' Prestige

PM1406134590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev: "Decisions Dictated By Life. At the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Defense and State Security Questions"]

[Text] One very important problem of the Army today is the strengthening of military discipline and organization and of the authority and prestige of military service. This was discussed at the latest session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Defense and State Security Questions, held in the Kremlin on 11 June. It was attended by USSR people's deputies, representatives of other parliamentary committees and commissions, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR People's Control Committee, USSR State Planning Committee, USSR Defense Ministry, Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and Main Military Prosecutor's Office, and members of the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers.

The Defense Ministry and Main Political Directorate attach great political and state importance to everything connected with maintaining discipline, organization, and order in the USSR Armed Forces, Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, stressed in his report. The practical activity of all components of leading organs and the vast majority of leading cadres is suffused with an awareness of responsibility for the solution of this task.

It was noted at the committee session that the Army and Navy have embarked on perestroyka with a heavy burden of unresolved problems. As part of society, they absorbed a considerable amount of the things that accumulated in the sphere of labor, production, and, indeed, state discipline sphere in the stagnation years. There was an increase in crime and incidents and other anomalies in the personnel's attitude to military service. The situation demanded the elaboration and implementation of specific measures to get the Armed Forces out of the stagnation impasse.

Nevertheless, Col. Gen. N.I. Shlyaga stressed, we still owe a great deal to our people, including in matters of military discipline. The process of strengthening organization and order has not become irreversible.

There is particular concern at the fact that cases of evasion of military service have increased considerably of late, the surge having started in the fourth quarter of last year. In 1989 they accounted for 90 percent of the overall increase in crime and in the current year they have more than doubled again. At the moment over 1,500 servicemen and military construction personnel who have gone AWOL from their units are being sought. Both internal and external factors have contributed to the growth of these negative factors. A number of military councils, commanders, and political organs and staffs were unprepared for the serious and responsible job of maintaining servicemen's lofty sense of responsibility for carrying out their constitutional duty to ensure the armed defense of the homeland. Not everywhere are they maintaining the requisite level of general organization and order. The lack of concern for people and their social and legal protection is proving slow to disappear.

But one must also mention the extensive actions by certain forces that are directly geared to undermining the cohesion of the Army and Navy and public appreciation of the importance of military labor. The Armed Forces, which find themseves at the center of the political power struggle, are experiencing mounting moral and psychological pressure. The atmosphere of insouciance is being fueled and Lenin's ideas about the defense of the socialist fatherland are being openly vilified. There are constant attempts to discredit the Army and Navy by distorting their role in the state's difficult history.

Ideological attacks on the Army have been supplemented by the decisions adopted by official state organs in some republics that paralyze union legislation on questions of military development. Direct approaches to servicemen to persuade them to leave their place of service have become more frequent. In a number of regions, particularly in the Baltic area and the Transcaucasus, a campaign is under way to protect deserters.

The session participants were informed of the measures being adopted by the USSR Defense Ministry and Main Political Directorate to strengthen discipline and organization in the forces. They involve, above all, paying more attention to people, increasing the educational influence of the whole structure of Army and Navy life, and democratizing it.

Nevertheless, one still has to mention the disgraceful phenomenon of bullying. This problem is basically due to major deficiencies in the cohesion of military collectives, commanders' and political workers' ignorance of

barracks life, the undermining of the role of NCO's, and the latter's lack of prestige. Recently distortions in interethnic contacts among servicemen have begun to have an active influence on the growth of nonregulation relations.

Undoubtedly, the key to the solution of the task of strengthening military discipline is a considerable improvement in the quality of the personnel and a definite improvement in the training of young people for military service. In this connection, it has to be said that the decision to defer the draft for students of higher educational establishments has considerably aggravated the problem of manpower acquisition. At the moment only 49 out of 100 eligible conscripts are being drafted. This has resulted in a decline in the quality of recruits joining the Army and Navy. For example, in 1989 over 43,000 people with criminal records were drafted into the Armed Forces, which is one-third more than in 1980. The intellectual and physical caliber of conscripts has declined.

Problems of strengthening discipline and resolutely enhancing the authority and prestige of officer service, which have declined considerably in recent years, are very closely interrelated and interdependent. Colonel General V.F. Arapov, first deputy chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Main Cadre Directorate, talked about this in his speech. There are many reasons for this, one of the most important being the lack of social protection for officers and their families and uncertainty about the future. In the Army and Navy today more than 170,000 officers' families lack housing. In the very near future, following the withdrawal of forces from Hungary and Czechoslovakia, there will be a further 27,000. Do these figures not explain the following fact? Last year 17,500 officers signed requests to be discharged from the Armed Forces, and an analysis shows that they were by no means the worst officers.

Their attitude to service has been adversely affected by extremist behavior and often by the overt persecution being practiced in a number of regions of the country. In some places officers have become targets for hooligans and criminals. The following alarming facts were cited at the committee session. Last year civilians were responsible for the deaths of 85 officers, 42 of whom were deliberately killed. In the first quarter of this year 21 officers died at the hands of criminals and 189 sustained wounds and various injuries. Add to this the discriminatory decisions that are being taken against officers by the authorities in a number of places and one may arrive at the unequivocal conclusion that the level of legal protection for them must be increased.

In preparing for the committee session, many of its members visited the troops and actually studied the state of discipline and law and order. That is why there was such a vigorous discussion of this important matter. The deputies talked about the need for a more determined struggle against such widespread phenomena as the concealment of crimes, protectionism, and rough treatment of young servicemen by older ones. Anxiety and the desire to find the correct and most rational ways of improving the situation in the Army—these were typical of every speech. Here are two brief fragments from the session minutes.

People's Deputy V.A. Yarin, member of the Presidential Council: I am a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Affairs of Women and of Family, Mother, and Child Protection and I am a major in the reserve. Today's discussion is something I feel strongly about. But I expected a lively, human discussion of these problems, not a bare account. We are forgetting that every soldier and every conscript must be seen primarily as a human being, a citizen of our country. It is terrible to see what conditions our soldiers—our children—are living in in some places. I flew to the unit my son is serving in and I know. We will achieve more through a decent way of life and splendid conditions for soldiers than through foul language and beatings....

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev: At the moment I am examining the plight of an officer—a naval seaman and a submariner. After being transferred to the reserve he obtained an apartment in Liepaja—in a block constructed by the Defense Ministry. But, although he has a voucher, he cannot register and obtain identity papers, therefore he does not get a pension. He, his wife, and his two children are forced to live in poverty because the Latvian Supreme Soviet has issued a resolution saying: no registration. How can one live or serve in these conditions? There is constant discrimination against the Army. We cannot tolerate all this. We must submit the question of the situation in the Armed Forces and assistance for them to the USSR Supreme Soviet for its consideration.

USSR People's Deputies Ye.P. Velikhov, V.N. Ochirov, V.P. Zolotukhin, V.N. Lopatin, Yu.A. Koltsov, Yu.P. Sychev, V.A. Opolinskiy, A.P. Klautsev, V.A. Martirosyan, V.S. Podzuruk, and others talked at the committee session about the need for the speediest implementation of thorough military reform and completion of work on a comprehensive program to combat nonregulation relations, establish the institution of alternative service, strengthen one-man commanmd on a legal basis, and improve cadre policy in the Armed Forces. Summing up the discussion, acting committee chairman L.V. Sharii stressed the need for the USSR Defense Ministry to adopt more effective measures to strengthen military discipline and law and order and increase leading cadres' responsibility for establishing regulation conditions of life and service in the forces and for observing law and order. The committee's resolution deemed it advisable to make it incumbent on the USSR Defense Ministry to elaborate an integrated program to improve social protection for servicemen.

Closely related to the first question was the long-overdue second question considered by the parliamentary committee session—the disbandment of military construction units used in the national economy. Reports on this question were delivered by committee secretary S.A. Tsyplyayev; Lieutenant General of Justice A.F. Katusev, chief military prosecutor and USSR deputy general prosecutor; Colonel General N.B. Chekov, USSR deputy defense minister for construction and the billeting of troops; A.B. Romantsov, deputy chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, and representatives of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, USSR State Planning Committee, USSR State Committee for Construction Affairs, and the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers. It was noted that 501 military construction formations involving a total of 329,000 people are currently working on the construction of national economic facilities in the charge of 20 ministries or departments. They are being used extremely inefficiently, often in subsidiary, low-paid work that is wrong for them. As a result many military construction formations are making a loss. Disregard of and indifference to people's basic needs result in increased crime. These units account for 40 percent of all offenses committed in a year in the Army and Navy. In the first four months of this year alone there were 1,700 serious crimes and 37 people were killed.

The presence of military construction formations in civilian ministries and departments, with young people serving in these detachments, is at odds with the USSR Constitution and the Law "On General Liability to Military Service" and contravenes international norms. In view of all these circumstances, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Defense and State Security Questions decided to submit for parliament's consideration a proposal on ending as of fall 1990 the drafting of conscripts into military construction units used in the national economy and disbanding them before 1 January 1991. Military construction detachments in the charge of the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry, the USSR Ministry of Communications, the Main Administration for Special Construction Work under the USSR Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work, and the Ministry for Construction in Eastern Regions of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] are to be treated as exceptions at this initial stage. It is recommended that military construction detachments in the aforementioned ministries and departments be disbanded before 1 January 1992. The third stage of this work, according to the committee, would be the elimination of construction units in the USSR Defense Ministry.

The members of the parliamentary committee deemed it advisable to address these proposals to the USSR president.

Slow Response Over Cessna Landing Criticized

PM1306142190 Moscow TRUD in Russian 13 Jun 90 p 4

[Report by O. Chikhladze, A. Trushin, and V. Badurkin, under the rubric "We Report the Details": "Flowers From... a Border Violator"]

[Text] TRUD has already described how an unmarked private plane landed at Batumi city airport (see: TRUD, 12 June 1990, "Do We Only Dream About the Border?") Today we can give readers the details about this, to put it mildly, unusual visit.

Lieutenant General Ye. Timokhin, first deputy chief of the Air Defense Forces Main Staff, described how border and air defense troops visual observation posts detected a violation of the USSR state border over the Black Sea approximately 11 km southwest of Batumi airport at 1432 hours 9 June.

A small, sand-colored Cessna aircraft (you will recall that this was the make of plane used by the well-known Herr Rust) flew in close to the hills at an altitude of 150-200 meters. The radar was unable to track it because of the considerable interference, of course.

Then, at 1435 hours, the Cessna taxied smoothly into the very center of the Batumi airport runway. Eye witnesses clearly discerned a red stripe along the side and writing in Arabic script. The plane's door opened and the pilot climbed out carrying two bouquets of large carnations and a placard. Placing the flowers on the runway the pilot returned to his plane and took off. The visit lasted little over 1 minute. At 1441 hours, the Cessna crossed the USSR border in the region of Sarpi (10 km southwest of the airport).

On its return journey, according to Turkish radio reports, (confirmed, incidentally, by the USSR Defense Ministry), a border detail fired at the plane with automatic weapons. The plane maintained complete radio silence throughout its flight.

Who was the pilot? The "gifts" that he left behind can provide some information about him and the purpose of his "visit," in which he violated USSR airspace. The text on the placard, written in German, ran as follows: "I dedicate this to Mikhail Gorbachev—a sincere and cultured politician. His views make peace eternal. We Germans are very grateful to him." Then there was an abbreviation in English which read "G.H.N." and the words "Must live." What does this mean? That is still unclear. The text on the placard ends in equally unusual fashion and, presumably, with a certain sense of irony: "No punishment! Hans Schneider."

Hans Schneider (if, of course, this is his real name) decided to pay the penalty immediately: Next to the placard and the flowers was a $20 bill....

Humor is one thing, but the violation of the state border could have had a more than unhappy ending for him. As

Lt. Gen. Timokhin explained to us, it takes time for the Air Defense Forces' MiG-29's on alert duty to take to the air. The Cessna was on our territory less than nine minutes. It is a good thing that the command did not decide to bring the plane down with antiaircraft missiles....

Have all the questions been answered, therefore? No, in our view, they have not. Why is there this gulf between the air defense troops and the border troops? After all, having spotted the violator the duty details quickly alerted the command at headquarters. The latter knows better than anyone that you cannot get a MiG's engines warmed up in such a short time. Why did the border troops combat helicopters not take off then? After all, a border violator is still a border violator, even if he does have a sense of humor, and he must be caught. This time the military were given some flowers. But next time?

And finally, one last question—Why was everything cloaked in such a veil of secrecy that even the most insignificant details, including the fact that the aircraft had landed at all, had to be literally coaxed out of officials at the KGB and the USSR Defense Ministry?

Baltic Republics

Norway Reportedly Refuses Aid to Baltics

LD1206164790 Riga International Service in Latvian 1730 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] As reported today by the all-Union central mass information media, Norwegian Government representatives are said to have declined a request for economic aid by representatives of the Baltic states. Talks between the foreign ministers of the three Baltic states and Norwegian officials, took place during the Baltic statesmen's visit to Scandinavia.

At the same time, Norway expressed its moral support for the Baltic striving for independence, as well as anxiety over the situation becoming tense in this region.

Baltic Popular Movements To Meet 16 Jun

LD1206190590 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1310 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpts] You are listening to news of the People's Front of Latvia, and today we will inform you first about how the Baltic Assembly—due to be held on the 16th [date only as heard], in Jurmala, at the House of the Composers' Union—is being prepared. [passage omitted] At the conclusion of the Baltic Assembly a mass action on the beach at Melluzi is envisaged. And, taking into consideration that the People's Front will not organize any undertakings on 17 June, this undertaking will be devoted in the first place, to the Baltic Assembly, and, secondly, it will also concern what took place during these days 50 years ago, i.e., in June 1940. So 16 June is the middle date between the occupation of Lithuania and the occupation of Latvia and Estonia in 1940. The idea there is that this Baltic Assembly is not being organized by chance on this date. So, this will be the only action which will be devoted, to a certain extent, to the events of 17 June 50 years ago.

Cooperation To Be Discussed

LD1206114190 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Excerpt] On 16 June the second Baltic Assembly of Lithuanian Sajudis and Peoples' Fronts of Latvia and Estonia will take place in Jurmala, a city in Latvia.

It has been pointed out at a news conference today in Riga that businesslike talks on the future of cooperation is the most important issue. While developing this cooperation, developments of democratic processes in the Soviet Union, in the countries of Eastern Europe, as well as the security of all Europe must be taken into consideration.

It is thought that both numerous guests from the Soviet Union and representatives from democratic movements in European countries will report on these issues. [passage omitted]

Baltic Republics Observe Day of Mourning

LD1406141890 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—The Soviet Baltic republics are today observing a day of grief dedicated to the 49th anniversary of the mass deportation of Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians to Siberia, which began on June 14th, 1941. Thousands of teachers, doctors, priests, farmers and other civilians were exiled by the Stalin regime and many were never to return.

Most enterprises and institutions stopped working in Lithuania today. The day of grief and hope coincided with a catholic holiday and a mass was given in Vilnius Cathedral square at noon.

Many Estonians have returned from concentration camps and the Siberian exile. They formed the Estonian union of illegally repressed people "Memento". On its initiative, wreaths were laid at the Tallinn Hirve Park, where a memorial plaque in honour of those who did not return was unveiled. Services will be held in churches throughout Estonia.

Similar ceremonies are under way in all the towns and districts of Latvia.

Moscow, Baltic Dialogue Examined

LD1406122690 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] The day of freedom for the Baltic peoples marked in the United States at the call of the House of Representatives is not conducive to promoting processes under way in the Soviet Union. These proceses include a very important dialogue on transforming the Soviet Federation, which has gathered the leaders of all Soviet republics. Mikhail Mayorov comments, and this is what he writes:

The session held on Tuesday [12 June] in Moscow by the Council of the Federation could not ease all ethnic tensions at once of course. However, it brought together all the parties involved in ethnic conflicts. The dialogue is becoming productive. This is proved by the fact that right after the session of the Federation Council President Gorbachev and Premier Ryzhkov received the Baltic leaders, the chairman of Lithuania's parliament, Vytautas Landsbergis, among them. Wednesday saw new contacts, this time involving Ryzhkov and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet Lukyanov on the one hand and Lithuania's prime minister Prunskiene on the other.

It seems that the two sides are beginning to find points of contact. Their point of departure is the assumption that neither party concerned thinks it is necessary to preserve the federation in its current shape. There are plans to create a union of truly sovereign states based on equitable economic relations. At any rate, this is the stand

taken by Moscow. As for Vilnius, it intends to achieve sovereignty for Lithuania on the road of its total secession from the USSR.

The differences between the two sides don't seem so irreconcilable considering that no one wants to conserve the old relationship. According to Landsbergis, the very idea of transforming the USSR into a union of sovereign states provides for a new turn in disputes on the Baltic problem. This statement alone proves that the emerging dialogue is useful, but what will follow? What will the Union be like after its radical transformation? A concept for this is to be worked out yet, and no republic, no matter how radical its attitude is, is likely to deem it unnecessary to join the search for (?a version.) A neighbor is a neighbor, and no one can be indifferent to what it looks like, what it builds relations with the surrounding world on. Witness the fact that Lithuania, though not viewing itself as a member of the Soviet Federation, still intends, according to Landsbergis, to take part in working out an optimal model of a union between sovereign states.

So, the dialogue has begun. This event immediately drew response from all who feel concerned about the Baltic crisis. President George Bush described the dialogue as a step in the right direction. Other countries have also responded favorably, but does everyone realize how delicate the situation is? The conflicting sides seem to be bent on focusing on the future, not on the past. But what is the intention of those members of the United States Congress who use such inciting terms as occupation and captivity? The complexity of the past decades doesn't allow to assess all this so unambiguously and catagoricaily. But if we want to bury all that is negative it is hardly wise to jeopardize, wittingly or unwittingly, the emerging trend towards resolving this issue at the negotiating table.

Article Assesses 'Baltic Freedom Day'

LD1406132690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1227 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Rejoinder by a TASS observer about 'Baltic Freedom Day'—"But If One Thinks for a Moment?"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 14 June (TASS)—TASS political observer Yevgeniy Babenko writes:

During discussion of questions of the national and state setup of the country at the latest session of the USSR Soviet of the Federation, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev put forward the concept of creating a union of sovereign socialist states.

A day before that, M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov received the chairmen of the Supreme Soviets of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. During that meeting an exchange of views took place on the situation that has taken shape in relations between the nationalities.

The chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet described the meeting with the USSR president as "businesslike, constructive, and passing off in a friendly atmosphere."

Referring to official Lithuanian representatives, agencies and the press report that one of the results of the meeting will be "a slackening of economic sanctions against Lithuania."

In short, things are moving. Those contacts, the absence of which they were reproachfully referring to in the West just a few days ago, are developing.

Against that background, it is very strange to see the resolution of the two chambers of the U.S. Congress on declaring 14 June "Baltic Freedom Day." The resolution calls on the President of the United States to put out a proclamation on "Baltic Freedom Day" and, in the course of 60 days, to present a report to Congress on concrete actions taken by the government with the aim of "supporting the peaceful restoration of the independence of the Baltic States."

If "Baltic Freedom Day" is a day of talks, a day of exchange of views, and a day of useful reflections, then we are "for" it.

But if it is yet another form of pressure, yet another form of blackmail? Then we,—and I think that many people will agree with me—are "against."

Since this is not at all a constructive form of discussing a big and serious problem.

Prunskiene Discusses Talks With Ryzhkov

PM1406150790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

["INTERFAX: K. Prunskiene on Meeting With N. Ryzhkov"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] A meeting between Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene and Soviet Government head Nikolay Ryzhkov took place in Moscow 13 June. After it was over K. Prunskiene answered questions from INTERFAX correspondent Renat Abdullin and representatives of certain other mass media.

Question: Would you please describe the details of today's meeting.

K. Prunskiene: I and my deputy, Algirdas Brazauskas, met with Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov and USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov. We were told that USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev had been intending to participate in the meeting but unfortunately was unable to do so because of a slight indisposition. We had a conversation about possible talks and the conditions for narrowing the gap between the sides' positions so that such talks can begin. The Soviet Government voiced its own attitude and President Gorbachev's position on the need to suspend our 11 March act of independence. It

also expressed its intention in this connection to rescind [otmenit] the economic sanctions or, as we call it, the economic blockade on the part of the Soviet Union. Many specific ideas were expressed about how it is now planned to transform the Soviet Union and how the Union market is to be developed and transformed. It was suggested to us that we participate in elaborating the new conditions for the Union market. The question, of course, is how Lithuania is going to behave—will it participate in a renewed Union of which we are still ignorant or will it immediately give a negative response, whereupon the only discussion would be about an independent Lithuania's relations with the USSR.

Question: But your act of 11 March is still in effect?

K. Prunskiene: The act is still in effect. What will happen to the act of independence in the future? Will it be suspended? But it would have to be suspended for the duration of the talks. Although the view that the act would have to be suspended for "the transitional period" has also been expressed from the Soviet Union's side. Today we cut back those demands. Suspending the act will be possible only for the period of the talks, and this period will not be infinite. It will be a definite period. But as yet we do not have the powers from parliament. Even the chairman of the parliament cannot say unequivocally how we will now act in view of the guarantees given to us on the ending of the economic blockade, the possibility of starting talks, and so forth. From the new things that were said in the course of today's conversation we understood that the Soviet Government has started to trust us more, and we now trust it more. What actions will follow? We are in no doubt that it is prepared to lift the economic blockade. That was stated very specifically. And we have an opportunity for action in this area by engaging in contacts with the Union government.

I think that we should discuss very carefully the possibility of suspending the act of independence for the duration of the talks. At the same time, this does not mean that all the documents adopted since 11 March will be revoked. That is a separate question which is currently the most controversial one in relations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union.

Question: Did I understand correctly that from the Union government's viewpoint suspending the act of independence is a condition for ending the blockade vis-a-vis Lithuania?

K. Prunskiene: Yes, that was precisely the way we heard it at today's talks. Incidentally, Nikolay Ryzhkov today defined our meeting as the start of what is already a concrete dialogue on the question of future talks. Because individual questions were put in very specific terms and our approaches were discussed.

Question: Did you discuss the problem of the military draft?

K. Prunskiene: We discussed this question, which is highly complex. At least we have no grounds for supposing that our young people will be forcibly drafted or forcibly taken away. We for our part will take certain steps to avoid providing pretexts for actions of that kind.

Question: You weren't given any specific promises on this score?

K. Prunskiene: They also intend to discuss the question among themselves because certain Soviet Union laws which the Defense Ministry observes very strictly are an impediment here. And I believe that conflict situations can be avoided by real actions on our part, simply by specific actions on the basis of direct agreements.

Question: Did you discuss the possibility of any easing of sanctions today?

K. Prunskiene: Yes, we discussed that too. But our ministers will have to meet again and discuss bilateral positions.

Question: Was the question of continuing contacts in Moscow examined?

K. Prunskiene: Of course. This will be done constantly.

Prunskiene Sends Letter of Thanks to Thatcher

LD1406192690 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1843 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Lithuanian Prime Minister Ms. Kazimiera Prunskiene today personally thanked Mrs. Thatcher for her part in helping towards the resolution of the republic's dispute with Moscow.

In a letter to Mrs. Thatcher, she said: "My colleagues and I are convinced that your efforts contributed to the Lithuanian question being considered more urgently in Moscow.

"It appears that these matters are moving towards a positive solution."

Mrs. Thatcher raised the Lithuanian question with Soviet leader Mr. Gorbachev when they met in Moscow last week.

Landsbergis, Others Attend Vilnius Ceremony

LD1506025790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius International Service in English at 2200 GMT on 14 June carries a 14-minute report on a ceremony in Vilnius Cathedral Square and a pilgrimage across Lithuania to mark the 49th anniversary of Stalin's deportations to Siberia.

The announcer says: "The ceremony in Cathedral Square was attended by President of Lithuania's Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis, Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene with her deputies, several other government members, a number of MPs [Members of

Parliament], top-rank guests from other republics, as well as the Orthodox Bishop (Chryssostomas). There was a sea of flags above the heads of the crowd. Those were flags of church organizations, the Vatican, the Lithuanian Tricolor, and the Polish white-red flag. Girls in the crowd wore folk costumes or long white gowns. That very hour ceremonies were held in all churches throughout Lithuania, in cities and townships, in settlements and villages.

"Amazing were therefore the orders of the local bosses in southeast Lithuania pronouncing 14th June a work day. The population of these regions is mostly Catholic and the deportations did not skirt them either. But these bosses apparently sympathized more with those who carried out the deportations than with the deportees."

A description of the ceremonies in Vilnius follows, and the chairman of the Sobriety Movement is interviewed about the pilgrimage.

Ceremony Described

LD1406201390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Today, in this the first year of Lithuania's independence, is the day of mourning, hope, and determination—Lithuania with Christ. The people of Lithuania remember and honor all exiles and martyrs who lost their lives while far away from the homeland, and remember the victims of resistance.

At noon, bells started pealing throughout Lithuania. Today's arrangements in the republic started with Holy Mass. Special celebrations took place in Vilnius in Archcathedral Square, where scores of thousands of people gathered. There were liturgical delegations from the parishes; church and state flags flew; flowers were scattered.

The celebrations were attended by the leaders of the republic of Lithuania and many deputies. Bells started pealing and a solemn Holy Mass was celebrated by the cardinal, and Lithuania's bishops. The archcathedral great choir says.

After the mass, chairman of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, read the act of the restitution of the position of the catholic church in Lithuania. The Cardinal read the renewed renunciation [word indistinct] which was signed by Cardinal Vincentas Sladkevicius, and the leaders of the republic of Lithuania—Vytautas Landsbergis, Kazimiera Prunskiene, bishops and heads of the Orthodox Church in Lithuania.

After the solemn acts the procession with the Holy Sacrament proceeded along the streets of the old city.

Minister Views Communications Network Problems

LD1206230490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1920 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] The government of the republic of Lithuania has approved the conception of work of the republic's communications. Journalists were acquainted with it at a press conference given by Communications Minister Kostas Birulis. The minister said that one of the most important tasks is the preparation of normative acts regulating the work of this branch. It is important to reach agreement with the Soviet Union's communications system. A draft aggreement has already been drawn up and handed over to the Ministry of Economics.

In the near future the minister will go to Switzerland to restore Lithuania's rights in the World Postal Union and the International Telecommunications Union. The minister stressed that serious difficulties exist in Lithuania in the development of the telephone network. Because the supply of cables from the Soviet Union has been stopped, there are difficulties in the construction of the Pasile automatic telephone exchange in Vilnius. A similar situation exists in Kaunas, in the Silainiai housing estate, and in Marijampole. On the whole, the development of the telephone network requires great expenditure: the installation of a telephone for one subscriber costs on the average R1,000. This sum is only repaid in 30 years.

The journalists were informed that the republic's communications workers are developing contacts with foreign firms. Possibilities are being examined to lay a direct communication cable to Copenhagen where one of the three international centers of communications is situated. This would create conditions for Lithuania to join worldwide communications.

Lithuanian Officials Discuss Radio Funding

LD1206122290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius International Service in English at 2130 GMT on 11 June broadcasts a report by Edvinas Butkus, an official from Radio Vilnius, on his visit to Moscow on 8 June with a delegation for talks with representatives of Soviet State Committee for Radio and Television Broadcasting. The delegation also included another member of the Lithuanian Radio and Television Board and an official from the Lithuanian Ministry of Communications.

Butkus begins his talk by saying that with the blockade in full swing, the allocations for radio and television broadcasting in Lithuania have been cut by "a few million rubles," and the brunt of the resulting cuts in broadcasting have fallen on the two Moscow television relays. The leadership of the Soviet broadcasting committee had therefore asked to meet with Lithuanian representatives.

"It became clear during the very first meetings in Moscow that its TV and Radio Committee was inclined

to allot extra funds for Lithuania so that it could rebroadcast the two programs of Moscow TV," Butkus continues. "The 45-minute talks with Mikhail Nenashev, chairman of the Soviet Television and Radio Committee, confirmed Moscow's readiness to grant Lithuania the necessary finance, about R11 million a year. It was agreed in principle that part of the sum might be used to expand the broadcasting time of Lithuanian TV to its previous length. It goes without saying that in making such a move the Moscow official stuck to the stand that Lithuania was still part of the Soviet Union. You can either agree or disagree with that, but you have to realize that besides utlimate goals there are also interim targets," Butkus says.

He continues: "As for Radio Vilnius, this issue naturally crept up during the talk with Mikhail Nenashev. The head of the Soviet radio and TV networks made it clear that if Moscow had to pay for relaying its TV programs to Lithuania, the latter would have to pay Moscow for beaming Radio Vilnius broadcasts worldwide through the system of Soviet-based relay stations. Well, the point can hardly be argued. We also learned in Moscow that transmitting our programs worldwide cost R300,000 a year and I found it very positive that we managed to bind reciprocal commitments into one package. That is a guarantee for a more stable situation and more solid grounds for us to lodge claims if, in the future, there is again a considerable weakening of the signal during Radio Vilnius broadcasts worldwide."

Butkus then stresses the importance of listeners reporting the quality of reception.

Butkus concludes by saying: "Although it had been agreed to keep within the economical and technical framework during the talk with Mikhail Nenashev and his two deputies, the political aspect emerged as we started considering the issue of Radio Vilnius. One of the deputies made referene to what he termed as the problematic content of Radio Vilnius programs. I wished to hear more specifically what he had in mind, but the answer was vague. I also explained to him that the evolution of Radio Vilnius was following its intrinsic logic and that the issue belonged to the political aspect which we had initially decided to shun. The Moscow officials agreed that the issue of Radio Vilnius found its way into the Moscow-Vilnius relay agreement only on the economic plane rather than political. For us, it was the major achievement at the Moscow meeting."

Lithuanian Party Plenum To View Independence

LD1406074890 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] It has been announced that a plenum of the Central Committee of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP] is to take place on Saturday. It intends to examine the problem: "Democracy and independence—organizational and parliamentary work of the LCP."

On this occasion secretary of the LCP Central Committee, Povilas Gylys, stated at an interview for the press that the LCP wishes to contribute concrete work to the restoration of Lithuania's true independence. Having stated that LCP strategy is for a gradual advance toward independence, Povilas Gylys said that, in his opinion, a greater step toward independence would be taken if the course proposed by the LCP was followed.

The secretary of the Central Committee said, without advancing any arguments, that in that case external relations will be extensively developed, with European and American businessmen and with scientists in all countries.

In preparing for the plenum the LCP newspaper TIESA has published various theses. It stated among other things that favorable conditions have been created to establish factions of LCP members in the Supreme Council and in local government. According to the theses of the plenum, the state of the party stipulates its further development in a social democratic direction. The party's new name must be selected, put into effect on time, and repesent a logical stage in the evolution of the party, stipulated by the interests of Lithuania and not by the situation in political relations, state the theses.

Report on 'Persecution' of Non-Lithuanians

PM1406090390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Dispatch by correspondent Captain Second Rank V. Gromak under "Direct Line" rubric: "'Defend Us Against Tyranny'"]

[Text] Vilnius—The Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Citizens' Committee. People constantly come here with their pain.

It was despair that brought Margarita Aleksandrovna N. (she asked that her surname not be mentioned), a CPSU member since 1967 and a worker, to the committee. "Help me to leave Lithuania," she said. "At work, it's constant humiliation, ('Russians, go to Kaluga, Poles, go to Poland.') My daughter, a USSR master of sport, has been forced to leave the physical culture institute because of constant persecution, she cannot get a steady job."

G. Polin, who has lived in Vilnius since 1958, was brought to the committee for the same reason. He asks that his own family and his daughter's family be included in transfer lists in the event of Lithuania's leaving the Union.

Incidentally, within the last week 105 such requests have been received. I have seen the lists. Among those making petitions are not only people who grew up in recent times in Lithuania. O. Rakitskene, for instance, has lived in Lithuania since 1911. Requests have multiplied from mixed families also. For example, a Russian wife will ask

to be moved together with her children, while her Lithuanian husband stays in Vilnius...

There are many written petitions from citizens requesting protection against tyranny. K. Burminstrova, a nurse whose father died defending Lithuania against the Nazis, has been fired without reason from her job. "We do not need occupiers," the head doctor's assistant declared to Klavdiya Yakovlevna.

I listen to the stories of citizens coming into the committee, and try to grasp the meaning of their statements... The Lithuanian parliament declaims at the top of its voice about the discriminatory policy of the USSR, and its violation of human rights. But then what are we to make of the following facts:

—the decision of the government of the republic not to effect payment of remittances of 100 rubles and more, and not to pay remittances to servicemen at all;

—the ending of the publication of the papers PRAVDA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and LIYETUVOS RITAS (in Russian);

—the wholesale tapping of telephone conversations, which are cut off by offensive interruptions into the conversation such as "Russian swine," or "Scram, Russian swine";

—the refusals of telephone operators to connect subscribers in Vilnius, with the explanation to anyone requesting: "We do not connect non-Lithuanians, or "Lithuania is for Lithuanians only."

And a list like this can be extended. Just drop by the Citizen's Committee.

Legality of Lithuania's Accession Stressed

LD1406114390 Moscow TASS in English 1123 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] Vilnius June 14 TASS—by TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun:

"Lithuania's accession to the Soviet Union cannot be regarded as forcible," Doctor of History Y. Yermalavichus, a resident of the Lithuanian capital, believes.

According to Yermalavichus "the declaration of the Lithuanian People's Sejm, adopted in July 1940, lays down that the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic's accession to the USSR in keeping with the working people's expressed will is bound to ensure its genuine sovereignty, industrial and agricultural progress, florescence of the national culture and development of material and spiritual forces of the Lithuanian people, to contribute to the building of a socialist society jointly with other peoples of the Soviet Union. This document expressed the will of the majority of the republic's population. This is a historical fact."

Yermalavichus recalls in this connection the Helsinki final act of 1975, which definitely proclaims the inviolability of the borders between all European states and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.

This view of an authoritative Lithuanian historian, which he shared with TASS, is in obvious contradiction to the stand of Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Vytautas Landsbergis and his supporters, to their desire to revise the existing European borders and to get Western support in their desire to take part in the forthcoming "Helsinki-2" conference. "If the Lithuanian parliament had common sense," Y. Yermalavichus says, "it would not seek the solution of this problem in the West, the more so since the people of Lithuania have not yet said definitely whether they want to secede from the Soviet Union or not."

"Lansbergis's policy to alter the existing borders suffers from subjectivism and is essentially nationalistic," first deputy chief of the ideological department of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee (CPSU), candidate of Philosophy, Y. Rakauskas told TASS. "All sober-minded Lithuanians realise full well that the interests of the Lithuanian nation are being put above the interests of the other peoples inhabiting the republic. This is a purely subjective approach, an abstraction, because national values cannot be put on a par with universal values and regarded as supreme. We should like esteemed Vytautas Lansbergis to explain popularly to his 'odedient' citizens what Lithuanian borders he wishes to restore—the borders of the 14th century, 16-17th centuries or the borders of 1939."

Council Creates USSR Soviet Liaison Group

LD1405215190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2019 GMT 14 May 90

[From the "Television Service" program]

[Text] [Newsreader] The economic situation in Lithuania is deteriorating. The number of unemployed is growing every day. In order to put the situation right, a group of deputies for liaison with the USSR Supreme Soviet has been set up in the republic's parliament. [video shows street scenes in Lithuania; gasoline pump nozzle lying abandoned]

Estonian 14 June Supreme Soviet Agenda Announced

LD1406200990 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Summary] Today's session of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet commemorated the victims of Stalinist repressions by standing up.

The session decided that the following points should be included on the agenda of the 11th session of the Supreme Soviet: 1) statement of the government with respect to the forthcoming 50th anniversary of Soviet occupation; 2) first reading of the Law on Leasing; 3)

information on the draft law on taxation and the draft law on the 1990 budget; [points 4 to 6 indistinct]; 7) endorsing the Presidium decree of 14 June 1990 with respect to liquidating Estonian Broadcasting; 8) second reading of the law on immigration; and 9) ecological protection of northweast Estonia.

"With a decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the radio and television organization—Estonian Broadcasting—will be liquidated. On the basis of Estonian Broadcasting, both Estonian Radio and Estonian Television will be established as independent organizations, and an information center and computer center as an independent establishment."

Estonian Parliament Discusses Immigration Law

PM1306155590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel A. Dolgikh: "From Tallinn": "Stormy Debates in Parliament"]

[Text] The republic's Supreme Soviet has discussed a draft immigration law on first reading. Despite the fact that the document was distributed to deputies before the sitting began, it aroused stormy debates. A considerable number of people argued, for instance, about the article which says that "the settlement and residence in Estonia of troop unit and USSR Armed Forces personnel... is regulated by agreements between the USSR, individual union republics, and others states, on the one hand, and the Estonian republic on the other..." The draft law also says that "former USSR Armed Forces servicemen who have been transferred from active service to the reserve or pensioned off and whose permanent place of residence prior to enlisting was outside Estonia, along with members of their families, may apply for a residence permit according to general procedure." This naturally puts servicemen in an extremely difficult position.

Another important event occurred in the parliament. An appeal was read out at the session to all Estonia's inhabitants on behalf of numerous veterans' organizations and the republic's United Council of Labor Collectives. I quote the document as follows:

"The so-called 'rally of participants in the liberation struggle in Estonia' will be held in the village of Tori, Parnu district 7-9 July, to which 'all brothers-in-arms'—veterans of the 20th SS Division and other formations who took an active part in the battles against the Red Army and in the punitive expeditions in Novgorod, Leningrad, and Pskov Oblasts, in the Ukraine, and in Belorussia—are invited. Their victims include many representatives of the Estonian people, communists, and Komsomol [Lenin Communist Youth League] members.

"The planned rally is the latest step toward reviving the spirit of fascism and legalizing the pro-fascist organizations condemned by all mankind on Estonian territory." Further, the appeal contains a call for people of goodwill to make a protest against the aforementioned rally and demand that it be banned. Let us wait and see how the parliament reacts.

Estonian Parliament Adopts Law on State Control

LD1406113890 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 0900 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpts] We will begin with a live relay from Toompea [seat of government] where the ninth session of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Estonia is continuing work today. Over to Gunnar Paal:

[Paal] [passage omitted The Supreme Soviet adopted the law on state control on its second reading, with 63 votes in favor, four against and 14 abstaining. Article 1 of this law says the following: "The state control of the republic of Estonia is independent in its functioning; it is a state body which carries out checks on the economy and is subject to the laws of the republic of Estonia; it checks on the lawfulness and efficacy of the use of the state's financial and material means and preservation of state property." [passage omitted]

Estonian Deputy Urges Union 'Common Market'

PM1306101990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by Academician M. Bronshteyn, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Estonian Academy of Sciences academician: "Facing the Market. The Price of Delay"]

[Text] The majority of our society recognizes the need to transfer to a market economy. The discussion merely concerns rates, mechanisms, and—especially important—the price that society will pay for this transition.

Generally speaking, society has always paid and will continue to pay for a market. The market means not only high efficiency of production and plentiful goods, but also the associated structural restructuring, and losses in production, and bankruptcies, and unemployment. So a modern market is impossible without a state support mechanism, including compensation for structural changes and social losses. Incidentally, we (the government, to be more precise) call such a market regulated, while in the West it is given a more accurate name—a social market economy. The West understood the need for this kind of market economy as a result of the social and economic cataclysms of the first half of the 20th century, while we have only understood it at the end of the 20th century. So we cannot avoid paying a special rate for the market—**the price of delay**.

Historians are amazed at how quickly and easily we transferred to the New Economic Policy after the destructive wars and war communism at the beginning of the 1920's. We would have paid a minimal price in the 1960's, when the state debt was a tenth of what it is now, and some kind of necessary part of the active population

remained in the impoverished Russian countryside. Even in 1985 there was not such an imbalance between the population's income and their payment in goods or an unthinkable budget deficit. History must not be rewritten, but it is time to understand the simple truth—the cost of transferring to the market will increase to an incredible degree if we continue to delay in adopting necessary though not always popular measures. And furthermore, the more we console ourselves and the people with unattainable illusions and utopias, the higher will be the price of transferring to the market.

You cannot cross a stormy torrent by riding the sacred cows of leveling and total collectivization. Even a couple of years back, we were being promised from the rostrums that no one would suffer in the transition to the market, that any price increases would be fully compensated. Indeed, many people's deputies managed to get elected under the populist slogans: We will give everyone everything—high wages and low prices. But such things do not happen.

The government program specifies quite a high price for a transition to the market: a reduction in production, structural unemployment, and a reduction in living standards to a degree that would not be covered by the compensation for price rises (approximately R65 billion per annum). Hopefully it will not be above 50 or 100 percent.

Of course, we could still try to delay the adoption of unpopular measures and carry out opinion polls and referendums. But who is going to want to pay the high prices in the market? Yes, a referendum proper has already begun—the totally empty shelves in the stores. And during the whole period of transition to the new prices we may have to pay another price, introducing a rationing or coupon system for basic necessities. The rest will circulate via the shadow economy inside enterprises and establishments, whose leaders and workers are already less concerned about working than about the distribution and the resale of scarce goods.

The problem is not one of totally eliminating the cost of transferring to the market (that is impossible), but of minimizing it. It seems to me that the government program and the USSR Supreme Soviet's activity contain serious errors which could greatly increase the cost of transferring to the market.

It is understandable that at the moment we are primarily concerned with the living standards of the least well provided-for section of the population. But how right is the desire to lay an excessively large burden on the shoulders of the most active section of the population, which by its labor and enterprise must lead us out of the pit we are in today? All this, as well as the bureaucratic fetters in the center and in the localities, could undermine motivation toward creative work and cause a drain of the best workers and the best minds. In the general negative background, it is pleasant to see an "island of hope"—Sakhalin (see IZVESTIYA No 145). The system of favoring enterprise as much as possible and the lowest possible taxes are a source of prosperity for the former island of hard labor prisoners (incidentally, the level of economic civilization in the center and in the localities is inversely proportional to the rate of taxes levied and requisitions).

It is said that we do not have enough material and financial resources to fully compensate for price rises. But the following very important resources have not yet started operating: freedom of enterprise and the realization of the creative potential of the most active section of the population; the sale of a significant part of the state resources, by installments or as units, in the spheres of manufacturing, trade, services (primarily small- and medium-scale); the allocation of underexploited plots of land to inhabitants of villages and cities who want them and who have the right of inheritance. The economic and social costs of the switch to the market will be minimal only in the event of real denationalization and the unleashing of enterprise and creative initiative. This should be the **main content** of the action program of the highest organs of power, including the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Government.

And there is another price for delaying, which we are paying and by all accounts will continue to pay. It is connected with growing interethnic tension and centrifugal forces. If you read the government draft carefully, you will notice that the imminent fall in output in 1991-93 is only connected with the structural restructuring of the economy. But why did an unplanned reduction in output occur at the beginning of 1990? The government report cites the price of national conflicts. In the first four months of this year, compared with the corresponding period last year, the dispatch of industrial output in the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] was reduced by 18 percent, in the Armenian SSR by nine percent, and so on. Some R868 millions worth of goods were not supplied under contracts with the Transcaucasian republics, that is, 28 percent of the overall volume of short deliveries in the country. We will evidently also have to pay a high price for economic sanctions against Lithuania. Finally, irreversible losses may arise as a result of the collapse of the general economic space in the country which has started to occur.

The desire of every people to become master of their own land and fate is irresistible. Demands to restore state sovereignty and independence are being voiced today not just in the Baltic republics. They were the dominating idea at the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. But in the face of an escalating economic crisis and a severe lack of goods stocks, the principle of "every man for himself" has started operating. Do not allow strangers into your market and do not let "your" product out of your hands—this is a marvelous sphere for the "activity" of the local bureaucracy, regardless of the national or regional uniform it may wear.

But can we save ourselves individually along the paths of the feudal division of markets? After all, the whole world

is moving toward economic integration, toward the creation of developed interethnic markets and the corresponding structures and mechanisms. The reserved nature of local markets means an autarky that is only capable of consolidating the market itself and lowering the population's living standard. Maybe the individual republics in the union can count on success through autonomous involvement on world markets? I maintain with all my authority that none of the republics, including the Baltic republics and the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) is competitive in its current economic state. I do not know where the myth that, in the next few years, Russia will become the most prosperous state in the world once it has thrown off the "burden" of the other republics has come from. What, by selling all its natural resources? But they are in the autonomous entities, in the North, and in Siberia. Such a trend will sharply increase centrifugal and parochial tendencies within the Russian Federation. And the mass sale of sulfur abroad will only bring down world prices, not to mention plundering future generations.

How can the disintegration of the united economic space in the Union be averted? Our commanders in the Moscow offices can no longer support any kind of regulated economic ties. Republic and local organs, and indeed enterprises, are beginning to stop taking them into account. The lawmaking activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet "for the whole Union" is becoming pointless. One after another, the republic soviets are declaring the priority of their laws over Union laws. We wasted four consecutive days on a detailed discussion of the Law on Pensions, during which there was an attempt to establish in advance how much each profession was to be paid in each region. After all, the scale of pension provision for citizens must be determined above all by the possibilities of the sovereign republics, while only partial compensation for unfavorable socioeconomic conditions and damages should come from the Union funds.

The latter depends in many ways on the realization of the USSR Government program on the transition to a regulated market economy. The republic Supreme Soviets are rightly demanding to be involved in the examination of all questions of increasing prices and compensation. Promises are being made that we will manage without any price rises at all, evidently at the expense of our neighbors, even though there is no chance of that.

Over a year ago, people's deputies from Estonia put forward a proposal to start the work of the USSR highest legislative organ with the renewal of the Union Treaty and transition to a differentiated structure (one that respects the individual features of each sovereign state) for a republic's ties with the union. The proposal was rejected. And we have already come up against the process of separating the Baltic republics from the union. On numerous occasions—including in IZVESTIYA—I have had to make proposals on the top-priority elaboration and adoption of a law, or rather a treaty, on the creation of and mechanism for a common market space. Its essence was to form a common market space in which all the republics that participate in the agreement and their economic subjects would operate freely and make agreements based on equal rights and a mutual system of favors and protection (prices, tariffs, payments, allowances, and subsidies).

A common market presupposes the presence of certain common economic and political structures, created by sovereign states. Such structures, including mechanisms for protection and mutual assistance, have been formed in Western Europe, which is moving toward greater economic and political integration. I believe that the presence of economic and political structures of a union market as well as consideration of the particular status of individual republics—the subjects of international law—could make it possible for us to unravel the tight Baltic knot, in everyone's interests.

None of the republics is ready to float free on the world ocean (with exchanges at world prices and in hard currency). And only free competition in a Union market will help each of them to find a worthy place in the world market too. But we are delaying here also. The central organs prefer to impose sanctions on the "unruly" republics, while the "unruly" republics prefer to avoid diktat under the slogan of restoring full independence, including independence from economic and political realities. And everyone will have to settle their account together when the standard of living is lowered and the interethnic conflicts are exacerbated in the face of economic chaos. In general there is a tendency to destroy and not to build. Again, "back to basics." And then... what brains and tact our successors will need to recreate a common market—the main condition for the successful development and prosperity of a union of free individuals and peoples—on the ruins of the administrative edict system.

I would note that the process of forming the structures of a common market has already begun independently of the will of the center. The three Baltic republics have adopted a decision on the formation of a common market which will be open to other republics and regions of the country. A. Sobchak, chairman of the Leningrad Soviet, has announced his desire to join this market. Horizontal contractual ties are developing between the republics. The reaching of an agreement on prices, payments, tariffs, common programs and funds, and customs and other forms of protection of the common economic space would be a logical conclusion to this still uncontrolled downward movement toward the regulation of economic ties. I am very much afraid that, in this process, the existing center may turn out to have the role of someone watching a departing train. Maybe even now, today, the republic Supreme Soviets and the USSR Supreme Soviet should begin to jointly draw up an agreement on the formation of and mechanism for the functioning of a common union market.

Plato, the great thinker of the past, valued the art of the healer and the physician more than anything. In present conditions, when the treatment of extremely neglected illnesses costs so much, the art of preventive medicine acquires particular value in politics and economics.

Russian-Speaking Group in Estonia Admits Failure

LD1406124590 Tallinn Estonian Television Network in Estonian 1800 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] With the events of 15 May we have played our trump cards into the hands of Savisaar: this is what Vladimir Yarovoy acknowledged at today's conference of United Council of Work Collectives.

[Unidentified reporter] It is clear that the so-called Russian-speaking community in Estonia is seriously worried about its future. What should one do specifically, however, no one can say. This is the impression left after today's second conference of the United Council of Work Collectives [OSTK]. It has now been functioning for a year and a half, but summing up what has been done amounts to little. There has been no success in establishing a strong association of union factories, or in going out to the foreign market with the production of those factories, as was planned in January 1988. Enterprises take an apathetic attitude toward the activity of the OSTK central authority. Last year they did not pay to the council R60,000. No progress has been made in educating the Russian intelligentsia in Estonia: the Russian youth are under Western influence. Elections to the Supreme Soviet did not go as required because the Russian-speaking electorate was passive. Statements and declarations made by the OSTK, up to the level of the USSR Congress [of People's Deputies] have borne no fruit. Rallies are beginning to have an effect contrary to that desired. Strikes harm the strikers themselves. The 15 May demonstration on Toompea did not go as it should have; it lowered the authority of the OSTK and played into Savisaar's hands.

This was the report at today's conference. In the future there will be efforts to make OSTK activity more active. Its own printing house is being established, a radio and television commercial channels have been planned, and today a start was made on establishing an association between territorial branches of production. It would unite all-Union enterprises and would not be subject to the republic, and it would be led by the USSR Government.

There were also other serious plans, but it seems that against the backdrop of all-Union processes and the awakening of Russia, the OSTK and its hitherto chairman are beginning to tire and are already searching for paths for a peaceful life together in the future. [video shows conference and speakers, people during a break in the foyer, a street meeting with red flags, scenes from 15 May riotous demonstration and strikes, a close-up of Savisaar]

[Vladimir Yarovoy, OSTK chairman, shown being interviewed] So what is it today: everyone here from the Baltic, about 3 million, running off to Russia! Who is waiting for us over there? Or, let us say, the other way round...

[Reporter, interrupting] But Yeltsin is issuing the invitation.

[Yarovoy] Well, I don't think that Yeltsin thinks about what he says.

*Latvia Considers Export Restrictions

904A0426A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 p 1

[Article by G. Grundulis: "In the Council of Ministers of the Latvian Republic. I. Godmanis: 'We Cannot Delay'"]

[Text] How to form the budget for next year, 1991; what kind of payments to establish for individual categories of economic formations; how to organize in the future the work of the Ministry of Transportation, whose task now, as we know, is to develop and implement state policy for the entire transportation and road complex of the republic. In short, once again there were many complex questions that were being decided at the scheduled session of the Council of Ministers, and it was not easy to find the only correct answer to them. After all, the state of the republic's economy, unfortunately, is still quite alarming. The state budget deficit is considerable, and there is a shortage of food and consumer goods. The store shelves are empty, undoubtedly because, as before, a large amount of goods are being taken outside the republic by various means.

Therefore, it is natural and correct that the agenda item on regulating the import and export of products and services in Latvia is being discussed thoroughly and in great detail. Members of the government working collectively agree that in order to ensure a greater balance of our goods and services market and to protect the interests of producers and consumers, it is necessary in the future, in addition to passing a strict law, to introduce temporary regulation of the import and export of individual types of products using quotas and licenses.

A list of products to be licensed is being approved. The Ministry of Economics has been instructed to set up a department of licenses, which will decide the most important licensing issues on behalf of the government of the Latvian Republic.

True, there are quite a few problems in this area. Just in the consumer cooperative system, for example, there are 6,000 groups of various products and more than 1.5 million different articles. Is it necessary now to formally request a license each time to export them? Of course, it is necessary to take into consideration the objections and proposals by trade workers here; otherwise, the assortment of goods will decrease. And how are industrial

enterprises supposed to operate when they are authorized to sell half of their above-plan production through direct ties with other plants and associations?

How do we draw the line between those who can export and those who cannot? This question was raised at the government session by Z. Indrikov, first deputy minister of internal affairs. He emphasized that militia workers can only record who exports what, but the customs specialists should be concerned about observance of the law in all other respects.

The list of products to be licensed for export from the Latvian Republic is very long, but the minister of health, E. Platkais, quite justifiably recommended that still more be added.

What is more important: irons being exported from the republic or medicines?

And his proposal to license medicines and healthcare items was supported by other members of the government.

There are quite a few unclear points about how to unfailingly organize licensing of exported products. Therefore, the final decision will be made at one of the subsequent sessions of the government. But one cannot but agree with the chairman of the Council of Ministers, I. Godmanis, who emphasized that we cannot delay in solving this problem, since every extra week that the streams of goods leave the republic without control worsens the supply of both industrial and food products for the residents of Latvia. The prime minister also stressed that it is necessary to find answers to questions related to the tasks of the customs department more quickly in this sphere. It was the unanimous opinion of all members of the government that it has to close the books on the problems of licenses and quotas within one week.

A resolution was adopted at the session on creating the Latgalskiy Joint Stock Commercial Bank. The decision on forming a scientific council of Latvia was not supported in the form presented. The problem needs to be studied deeper and in more detail. The question of future use of the government ATS [automatic telephone station] was clearly decided: a considerable portion of the government telephones are to be moved from the offices of individual ministries and party leaders to improve operational communications of enterprises and organizations.

The Council of Ministers approved Ayvars Baumanis as director of the Latvian Telegraph Agency (LETA), Valdis Zaykat as deputy minister for governmental affairs of the Latvian Republic, and Inara Bite as first deputy minister of social security.

Latvian Food Hoarding Follows 'Independence'

904D0144A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 p 2

[Article by B. Borisov: "According to the 'Blockade' Norm?"]

[Text] As LETA reported for general information, by decision of the republic government, coupons are being introduced effective 1 June for acquiring those food products which recently have become very high in demand. Residents of the city will receive coupons for flour, cereal, and pasta. The trade administration of the Riga Gorispolkom assures us that the established minimum will be fully provided. Thanks for that!

But why did this "rush demand" occur? The assault on the stores was prompted by the Declaration of Independence of Latvia adopted by the republic's Supreme Soviet. Even those who enthusiastically welcomed the declaration rushed to buy up everything in succession and stock up on goods that are in daily demand. No one believed the reassuring statements that the bases were full. The example of Lithuania showed convincingly the disastrous consequences of only a partial disruption of the long-lived stable economic ties with other union republics. After all, many food products are not produced in Latvia itself.

That is why the rush buying occurred: pride is pride, but you have to eat...

Of course, trade should be immediately normalized in such a difficult situation. And a solution was found—coupons were added.

In principle, this does not evoke opposition: No one feels like running from store to store and jostling in lines for a package of flour. There are enough shameful lines for alcohol, and now for gasoline for private vehicles.

But what are the norms set by the government? A half kilogram of cereal and the same amount of flour per person per month! The norm for pasta is 0.5 kg for 4 months. Not even a chicken would get full on such a ration!

Figure it up for yourself how much cereal, flower, and pasta you would be able to eat in a day. People did not know such norms during the hard war years.

And why recall years gone by. Answering a question from inquisitive readers, the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY (No. 21) cited the daily allotment of food products that is proper for convicts who are in places of confinement. They receive, in particular, 110 grams of cereal...a day!

I cannot believe that the gentlemen from the parliamentary faction of the People's Front of Latvia, who voted unanimously in favor of the unconstitutional declaration, will also be satisfied with the paltry "blockade"

norm. After all, there is no blockade. The country's government has not undertaken any economic sanctions against our country.

Hoarding, 'General Instability' in Latvia

PM1405160990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 May 90 First Edition p 1

[Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report under "Direct Line" rubric: "What Does Tomorrow Hold in Store?"]

[Text] Riga, 12 May—A typical scene in Riga these days is one of serpentine lines of people waiting in front of the stores. With good reason people ask: What is on offer? People are snapping up absolutely everything, even old cans of fish which previously no one had particularly wanted. The commotion has been going on for some days day. Stocks of flour, pasta, salt, canned meat, and matches have disappeared from the shelves.

The food panic began the day after the republic's Supreme Soviet announced the "independence transitional period." As T. Tverijonas, first deputy chairman of the city executive committee, said in an interview, "Lithuania's example was more than enough to make the people feel uncertain and to start laying in supplies."

Yes, such is the price of the new parliament's first political decisions. And the artificially created fuss over food, or the "pasta panic," as they call it here, goes on. Nor did the statement on television by I. Godmanis, the new head of government, succeed in calming the public. To counteract the exaggerated demand for foodstuffs and control purchases the republic's (old) Ministry of Trade recommended the introduction of quotas for food products in 24 commodity categories and also the gradual transition to a voucher system. Such a system has already been introduced in Daugavpils and Yelgava and one is due to be introduced in Riga at the beginning of June.

The general situation of instability in the republic is aggravated by the fact that the United Council of Labor Collectives has called on the population to stage a political strike 15 May. The main demand was: "To revoke the decision of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session of 4 May 1990 aimed at overthrowing Soviet power in Latvia and the latter's withdrawal from the Soviet Union." The appeal has already been supported by participants in a rally in Riga 9 May dedicated to the 45th anniversary of the Soviet people's Victory in the Great Patriotic War.

What does the future hold in store? That question—which is not purely rhetorical, incidentally—seriously concerns many people in the republic now. It would seem that even those who decide policy are not completely clear about it, either. And as it recently emerged, several new leaders are hurriedly setting off on foreign trips. For help and advice, maybe? But in Tallinn the leaders of the three Baltic republics are discussing the question of reviving the treaty between Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia signed in 1934.

Latvian Bodies Discuss Future of Communist Party

PM2305100190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 May 90 Morning Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by correspondent Irina Litvinova: "Politics Without a Break"]

[Text] Riga—During the parliamentary interval many Latvian Supreme Soviet deputies have been active in public and political organizations.

On Saturday the republic heard on the radio ardent speeches at a session of the People's Front Duma. On Sunday the congress of the Committee for the Protection of the Constitution and Rights of Citizens of the USSR and of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] was lacking in this kind of glasnost, but I can vouch for the fact that there too the temperature of the debate was very high.

To the question whether the People's Front would be disbanded once it has carried out its chief political task, the Duma answered categorically: No way! In fact, the speakers said, many Latvian People's Front functionaries have taken up posts in soviets at various levels and have obtained other leading positions, and this means that new forces have to be called up to take their places in the People's Front structures. The refrain was: The struggle is not over, it is only beginning. There was an announcement of a considerable reduction—by as many as 59 staff—in the People's Front apparatus. A great impact was made by Council of Ministers Chairman (former People's Front deputy chairman) I. Godmanis' pronouncement to the effect that the Latvian Communist Party could be outlawed if it continues to behave as before. On Sunday A. Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, touched on this thesis about the possible future of the party in a speech at the congress of the Committee for the Protection of the Constitution and Rights of Citizens of the USSR. He proposed unity of all forces advocating genuine rather than formal democracy on a constitutiuonal basis.

The congress was attended by 1,500 delegates from various rayons and cities in Latvia. The speeches by inhabitants of small towns—where, they said a new ideological monopoly, that of the People's Front is taking hold—were particularly worrying. People are scared. They are being used as an abstract "people," while the specific concerns and needs of the peasants continue to arouse little emotion in the capital. "I will speak in Russian," P. Anspok of Koknese said. "Please bear with me if it is not that fluent. They say that it is only Russians who do not go along with the new trends. There are also many Latvians who do not agree, only they are afraid to oppose them. But can one remain calm when one hears that we will go barefoot and hungry if we go our own way? Let us have a referendum, then we will

know who wants what, and also what rights those people who do not want to go their own way will have."

A letter to USSR President M. Gorbachev was adopted at the congress. It talks of the need to accelerate the elaboration of a union treaty on ensuring real political and economic sovereignty for the republics in a renewed federation, taking the interests of the peoples of the Latvian SSR into account. An appeal to the peoples of the Estonian SSR and Lithuanian SSR notes that the stabilization of the economic development of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia is possible only in conditions of public consensus, not political tension, confrontation, and uncertainty.

RSFSR

'Probable' Candidates for RSFSR Premier Noted

LD1406132890 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Lvov]

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—The Russian parliament is expected to discuss candidates for the post of prime minister of the largest Soviet republic this afternoon.

The most probable candidates include people's deputy of the USSR and the Russian Federation Mikhail Bocharov; present head of the Russian government Aleksandr Vlasov; and first vice-premier of the Soviet Government, people's deputy of the Russian Federation Lev Voronin. The nomination of less widely-known deputies is not ruled out. One of them is Viktor Yelstsov, a prominent Tatarian manager.

The candidates will have to outline their programmes at a joint meeting of both chambers—the Council of the Republic and the Council of Nationalities. The candidate who wins the support of the majority of the Russian Supreme Soviet, has to be endorsed by a plenary meeting of the First Congress of People's Deputies of Russia, which will resume its work in the Great Kremlin Palace on June 16.

More Candidates Named

LD1506073490 Moscow TASS in English 0725 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—The first session of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation [RSFSR] is today discussing the appointment of a chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers.

Candidacies for the prime minister have been named. They include Mikhail Bocharov, a prominent economic executive from Moscow region; Ivan Silayev, USSR deputy prime minister; and Yuriy Ryzhov, rector of the Moscow Aviation Institute.

The republican parliament is expected to appoint a chairman of Russia's Council of Ministers today. After that the appointment must be endorsed by the republic's First Congress of People's Deputies, which will resume its work in the Kremlin on Saturday.

Programs Presented

LD1506102890

[Editorial report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 15 June carries a seven-minute report by Correspondent Igor Zorin from the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

Zorin reports that Mikhail Aleksandrovich Bocharov, Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, and Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhov were nominated as candidates for the post of chairman of the Council of Ministers. It was decided that each candidate would be given 30 minutes to present his program, and 20 minutes to respond to questions.

Zorin reports that Bocharov was the first to take the floor. His program is very radical and modern, in keeping with the times says Zorin. Bocharov promised to present a working program in 30 days if he were elected. That program will come into force in 30 days. Zorin reports that there are four stages in Bocharov's program. The second one is a broad privatization of property. Under this program, it would will be possible to buy property and shares of the state by paying cash or getting credit. Foreign investments would be welcome as well. The Gosbank [State Bank] should be subordinated to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, Bocharev suggests. There should not be unemployment and prices should not be raised, according to Bocharov. He suggests that mass conversion of military and industrial enterprises to producing everyday goods should take place. In the social sphere, the wages should go up and other benefits should be introduced. The cost of living would be index-linked for those who did not earn a lot in the past.

Zorin reports that Silayev outlined his program as well. Silayev suggested his own concept, and supported many tendencies in the present economy, dwelling on scientific and technical progress. Zorin reports that Silayev will answer questions for 20 minutes after the break. Ryzhov will set out his program afterwards.

Ryzhov Withdraws Candidacy

LD1506112390 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, at the first session of Russia's parliament, today suggested three candidates for the post of the republic's prime minister—Mikhail Bocharov, Yuriy Ryzhov and Ivan Silayev.

After Bocharov and Silayev presented their brief programme statements and fielded questions from members of parliament, the third candidate—Professor Ryzhov—unexpectedly withdrew his candidacy.

Parliament began to discuss the two remaining candidates, after which the head of Russia's new government is expected to be determined by secret ballot.

Bocharov was born in 1941. He graduated from Krasnoyarsk State University and is a lawyer by speciality. He is a member of the Soviet Communist Party. For a number of years he has headed the building materials company in Moscow region.

In 1989 Bocharov was elected a USSR people's deputy. He is one of the leaders of the inter-regional group of deputies. In 1990 he was elected a people's deputy of the Russian Federation in one of Moscow's districts and is one of the leaders of the deputies' group Democratic Russia.

Silayev was born in 1930. He graduated from the Kazan Aviation Institute as a mechanical engineer. He is a member of the Soviet Communist Party.

He worked at the Gorky aircraft factory, was USSR deputy minister and then minister of the aircraft industry, and headed the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Instrument Making Industry.

Since 1985 he has been deputy chairman of the Soviet Government and chairman of the government's machine building bureau, which coordinates the activities of four ministries.

Moscow TV Relays 14 June Supreme Soviet Session

Equality of Chambers Viewed

LD1406200690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1715 GMT on 14 June begins carrying a recorded relay of the 14 June session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The session begins with registration. Yeltsin is in chair. A Moscow deputy comments on the seating arrangements. A vote decides that deputies need not always sit in one and the same seat. Registration is completed.

Media coverage is then debated. Should joint sessions be televised in full? A vote is deemed unnecessary and the proposal is adopted.

At 1725 GMT the agenda is discussed. Yeltsin speaks on the timetable, suggesting a month's recess.

At 1728 GMT Deputy Abdullatifev speaks. He says that the Soviet of Nationalities is doing good work. Some subcommissions may become commissions, he says.

At 1736 GMT Vladimir Borisovich Isakov comments on preserving the equality of the chambers. Options are discussed for achieving this. He thinks a number of "additional conditions" are needed, and describes them.

At 1740 GMT Yeltsin says that each condition must be discussed separately.

A discussion ensues in which various deputies make brief points about the equality of the chambers and problems of numerical parity.

At 1751 GMT a vote is held on whether the establishment of commissions should be within the competence of each individual chamber. The motion is passed.

At 1753 GMT Yeltsin says that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet will devote 15 June to electing the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

At 1755 GMT an unidentified deputy proposes merging the property and economic reform commissions. Other deputies voice their agreement.

At 1758 GMT a vote is held which approves the merging of the two commissions.

At 1800 GMT an unidentified deputy proposes dropping the name "economic" from the proposed commission. A debate ensues and at 1808 GMT the Supreme Soviet votes in favor of dropping the word from the name.

Additional submissions are made by deputies and at 1812 GMT a vote is passed to end the debate.

Committees Discussed

LD1406201890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1815 GMT on 14 June continues its recorded relay of the 14 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether the committee on the development of self-government is to continue its existence. The vote is conducted and the committee's existence is approved.

At 1819 GMT a deputy calls for the continuation of the committee and agrarian questions. Suggestions for its name are made by various deputies.

At 1822 GMT Yeltsin puts to the vote the ending of this debate. It is ended.

The continued existence of the committee is put to the vote. It is passed.

At 1824 GMT Yeltsin reads out the various suggested names for the committee. The officially suggested name is adopted: The Committee for the Social Development of Rural Areas, Agrarian Questions, and Food.

At 1827 GMT several deputies say that the proposed number of committees cannot be sustained by the limited number of deputies.

At 1829 GMT Deputy Osmenin says that construction materials should have its own committee. Deputies speak of the importance of construction.

At 1834 GMT an unidentified deputy quotes the Constitution on the functional differences between the two chambers.

At 1836 GMT Yeltsin says that there should be a smaller number of committees.

Deputies discuss the proliferation of committees.

At 1843 GMT a Yakut deputy says that a committee on construction is essential.

At 1844 GMT an unidentified deputy suggests commissions of the two chambers to ensure parity on committees.

At 1848 GMT the recorded relay breaks off for World Cup soccer.

More on Committees

LD1406224290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2100 GMT on 14 June resumes its recorded relay of the 14 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputies are still discussing procedural matters to do with the setting up of committees and commissions.

At 2105 GMT Deputy Akmetov says housing and services are a nationwide concern. Yeltsin says chambers were originally authorized to form committees at their discretion. A speaker says it's impossible to have a committee for every problem. Some functions should be allocated to the Council of Ministers. We should not get bogged down too much in procedure. A vote decides against a committee on construction and architecture. Yeltsin says each chamber must decide about commissions, names, membership and inform the Supreme Soviet, and recommend committees. The Supreme Soviet's decision on committees will be final.

At 2114 GMT an unidentified deputy says if each chamber sets up as many committees as it likes, there will be problems.

Yeltsin warns that too many commissions will make an immense amount of work, and also create disagreement. A deputy says the Constitution lays down powers of each chamber. Another says deputies from territorial okrugs should not be restricted in their work. A deputy from Moscow Oblast says the rights of nationalities won't be infringed. People who are not elected to the Supreme Soviet should work in the commitees, says another. Ivanov, of Sverdlovsk, says one of the proposed committees, on local government, is stillborn and useless. A speaker says the committees must not be seen as superior to the commissions. The question of parity is mulled over again. Yeltsin is asked to define parity. Arguments on procedure continue. A member of the Supreme Soviet says there must be a committee on sport and physical culture. Both committees and commissions must be expanded.

At 2126 GMT Deputy (Praporshchik) talks about how many committees may be formed according to the Constitution.

At 2130 GMT Silayev talks about the numerical aspects of parity.

At 2130 GMT an unidentified deputy quotes the Constitution on the possible inclusion of peoples deputies in commissions.

At 2132 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote in principle on whether to have a commission on architectural matters. This is passed.

Yeltsin says that the two chambers should pursue the question of committees further and put forward recommendations. A week should be enough.

At 2135 GMT it is announced that tomorrow a joint meeting will discuss the confirmation of the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR, starting at 1000.

At 2136 GMT procedural announcements are made.

At 2137 GMT Yeltsin says that the chairman of the Supreme Soviet will no longer rely on the KGB for protection but set up a small service of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The deputy chairman reads out a draft decision on this issue. This is put to the vote but there is a problem with registrations.

At 2142 GMT a deputy asks why RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs cannot deal with protection. Yeltsin responds that this is normal procedure for a sovereign state.

At 2144 GMT the draft decision is put to the vote. It is passed

At 2146 GMT a deputy asks for more details about the candidates for the post of premier and which ones Yeltsin supports.

At 2147 GMT the relay ends.

Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session

Session Dates Adopted

LD1406172890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Aleksandr Ruvinskiy report from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet session]

[Text] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet session started with a joint session here in the House of Soviets on Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment, the first joint session of the chambers, less than half an hour ago. Already many sufficiently important decisions have been made. First the deputies discussed how they should sit in the auditorium where the session is being held—according to chambers or according to some other principle. Moreover, they came to an agreement that each person is free to take the seat in the auditorium that he likes. Such a democratic decision was made.

The session examined the procedure for coverage of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's work on television and in the press. The following decision was adopted: All joint sittings of the session will be broadcast in full on television; a recording will be broadcast in the evening; and the sittings of the chambers will be covered with reports. In the near future the issue of setting up a Russian television company will be decided.

Also confirmed at the session was the agenda of the first session of the Supreme Soviet of Russia. There are a fairly large number of points. It is proposed that the deputies will work today and Saturday, and then there will be an interval. Then the work of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet will resume from 25 June through 30 June. Then there will be a break of one month, and the session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet will resume its work on 1 August.

At the session that has just started, the committees that are to be affiliated to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation have to be approved. Then it will approve the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation. That is the next point on the agenda of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session. I end my report with this for the moment.

Committees, Commissions Formed

LD1406173290 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—The Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, in its first session here, today discussed the formation of its commissions and committees.

One of the parliament's chambers—the Council of the Republic—focused on principles of forming these parliamentary bodies. A prolonged discussion of various plans for their formation prevented the council from actually forming the bodies.

The other chamber—the Council of Nationalities—was more efficient. It elected deputies from the autonomous republic of Tataria in Volga region, from Bryansk region in Central Russia and the Autonomous Republic of Yakutia, northeast Siberia, to head three standing commissions.

In the afternoon, the two chambers held a joint session, at which they discussed the list of parliamentary committees.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin told the joint session that on Friday parliament will discuss the appointment of Russia's prime minister.

Protection Resolution Adopted

LD1406173790 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow June 14 TASS—The Russian parliament today adopted by majority vote a resolution on the protection of the Russian parliament president.

According to the resolution, a sub-unit is to be formed within the Russian parliament's Secretariat to ensure the personal security of the president, now Boris Yeltsin.

Speaking of the draft resolution, Russian President Boris Yeltsin noted that the State Security Committee (KGB) had previously been responsible for guarding the president. The proposed draft aimed to eliminate the dependence of the Russian president on this issue, Yeltsin said.

Russian Communists Conference To Open 19 Jun

LD1406140690 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Only four days are left before a conference of the communists of the Russian Federation, the largest Soviet republic, is to take place. The conference will open in Moscow next Tuesday [19 June]. The delegates, 2,700, will take part in the formation of a Russian Communist Party. Vitaliy Gurov elaborates:

[Gurov] This conference will get the status of a founding congress, but it will definitely follow heated discussions and exchange of opinions likely to reflect the whole spectrum of political views, from the left wing radicals and extreme conservatives. [passsage omitted]

Some wonder whether the Russian Communist Party, with its membership accounting for 60 percent of the communists in this country, will turn into a force capable of solving all questions in the interests of its republic alone. Others fear lest the Russian communists who have

won independence should split the party. How grounded is this fear? [passage omitted]

So a Russian Federation party conference will open next Tuesday., If the delegates decide to form a Russian Communist Party they will elect this party's first secretary and leading bodies. Then there will be an interval for the duration of the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, and then the Russian communists will resume their work to divert their platform and adopt party rules.

Russian Bureau Session Viewed

PM1006180790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Questions of Preparation for Russian Party Conference"]

[Text] A joint sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau and the Russian party conference preparatory committee, chaired by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau, was held 9 June to examine the main questions relating to the work of the Russian communists' upcoming forum. This has been preceded by tremendous, painstaking activity on the part of the committee members and its working groups to elaborate draft documents and prepare the conference materials.

M.S. Gorbachev addressed the sitting. Dwelling on the situation in the country and the party on the threshold of the 28th CPSU Congress, he provided information about the work on the draft CPSU Central Committee platform and the draft CPSU statutes, and the preparation of the CPSU Central Committee's accountability report. The forthcoming party congress will be a turning point inasmuch as it is intended to consolidate everything that has been achieved with such difficulty not only by the party but also by all of society and to analyze the experience of the five years of perestroyka in order to make serious generalizations and forecast the immediate prospects for the party's activity in the new conditions.

The Russian party conference is acquiring particular importance in all the CPSU's precongress activity, M.S. Gorbachev stressed. The creation of an RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party is one of the most important questions to be considered by its delegates. In view of the real situation and public expectations, there can be no delay in forming it. At the same time it is necessary to act in a well-considered fashion in order to ensure that this step does not promote the development of centrifugal tendencies but is aimed at ensuring the unity of the CPSU and all society.

Touching on specific questions relating to the Russian party conference, M.S. Gorbachev pointed out that various proposals have been submitted on this subject. One such proposes the adoption at the first stage of a resolution on the formation of an RSFSR Communist Party, the election of the first secretary, and the formation of an organizational committee with a view to convening a constituent congress in the fall. Another proposal is for the conference to be constituted as the constituent congress and for the Communist Party's leading organs to be elected there.

These questions were the subject of lively debate among the sitting's participants. It was decided to take the extensive range of opinions, proposals, and comments into consideration in the course of further preparatory work and to submit them to a council of delegation representatives for consideration. Most of the preparatory committee members advocated the Russian party conference's constituting itself as the constituent congress of the RSFSR Communist Party. It was stressed here that the conference itself will take the final decision on this question.

During the discussion the members of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau and the preparatory committee deemed it advisable, in view of the importance of the question of setting up an RSFSR Communist Party, to recommend M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau, as the keynote speaker at the conference.

G.I. Usmanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, provided the sitting with information on procedural questions related to the holding of the party conference. His speech touched on questions of the agenda, the formation of leadership organs, the order of work and standing orders for the conference, the preparation of draft conference documents, the holding of a council of delegation representatives, and accommodating those involved in the Russian party conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses' conference hall.

The preparatory committee has been instructed to finalize the proposals on leadership organs, the order of work and standing orders, and the draft conference documents in light of the exchange of opinions that has been held and to submit them to a conference of delegation representatives scheduled for 16 June in Moscow.

In view of the fact that workers and peasants are inadequately represented among the delegates, it has been deemed advisable to invite to the conference 200 communists representing the working class and the peasantry. It was recommended that decisions be taken on this question at plenums or enlarged bureau sessions of kray and oblast party committees. It was also decided to invite representatives of all the union republic communist parties as guests.

The following took part in the work of the joint sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau and the Russian party conference preparatory committee: CPSU Central Committee Politburo Members V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, V.A. Medvedev, and N.N. Slyunkov; Candidate Members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo A.V. Vlasov, B.K. Pugo, and G.P. Razumovskiy;

CPSU Central Committee Secretaries O.D. Baklanov and I.T. Frolov; and the heads of CPSU Central Committee departments.

Preparations Reported

PM1206100990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Single Edition p 8

[Report by V. Davydov and I. Osadchiy, members of the Russian Party Conference Preparatory Committee: "Heat of Debates"]

[Text] Preparation for the Russian party conference has entered the final stage. Just a few days remain until it begins. Yet general party debate is in fact continuing in the republic's party organizations and in the CPSU as a whole. During the debate there is a keen discussion not only of the drafts of various platforms but also of the very topical and complex question that is the creation of a Russian Communist Party.

Disputes are proceeding around this idea during which diametrically opposite opinions are being revealed and diametrically opposite views are being voiced. It seems the tension has reached its culminating point. And we members of the Russian party conference preparatory committee can feel this particularly as we study the communists' remarks and proposals voiced at party meetings and conferences and in the press and in letters addressed to the party committees and newspaper editorial offices. The majority of members of the preparatory committee are now in the midst of the party masses: They are acquainting themselves with their mood, reporting on the progress of preparation for the conference, consulting with its delegates, accumulating various viewpoints, opinions, approaches, and assessments, and speaking in the mass media.

Our working group for the study, consideration, analysis, and systemization of material for the report at the conference includes representatives of many of the republic's kray and oblast party organizations. This is perhaps the first time in the practice of our party that what in our opinion is such a democratic experiment has been conducted, when the most important part of preparatory work is not done by the central party apparatus. In our view this experience is very useful. Naturally, the workers of the CPSU Central Committee departments have not been removed or isolated from our activity. But their participation is auxiliary, it affects the provision of information and reference material, the generalization of information on the course of the CPSU's precongress life and the discussion of the drafts of the precongress documents in the RSFSR party organizations.

In recent days the work has also been joined by G.K. Rebrov, representative of the organizational bureau of the Russian communists' initiative congress in Leningrad and a delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress. Although he is not a member of the preparatory committee we expressed ourselves in favor of joint work with the Leningrad initiative group with a view to consolidating all forces which stand on positions of the party of the Leninist type, whose policy goals are a Leninist identity for socialism and a communist perspective. Other delegates and members of the Leningrad initiative congress organizational bureau also took part in the work of the preparatory committee.

The meeting with representatives of the "Russian Communists" group formed at the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies by I.M. Bratishchev, G.V. Sayenko, V.V. Seleznev, and Yu.G. Gekht, who expressed themselves unanimously in favor of creating a RUssian Communist Party on the basis of Leninist ideological and organizational principles, was useful for us. The majority of members of the working group took part in the work of the CPSU kray and oblast conferences and tried to express to the maximum their spirit and mooed in the drafts of the documents and materials under preparation.

Right now our group has already prepared a number of options for the material. They differ fundamentally in both structure and style and in many cases in content, conclusions, and assessments. There are numerous hypothetical options even for the title of the material for the report. Work is proceeding in an atmosphere of keen debate and the exchange of opinions on each question of any importance, even on the formulation of individual clauses. And it will continue until the last day of preparation for the Russian party conference, because the processes taking place today in the country, the RSFSR, and the CPSU are extremely swift, contradictory, and diverse. The material for the report will be examined at the final stage at a sitting of the preparatory committee and only after its approval will it be possible to speak of it as an official document.

It is also appropriate to mention that, of course, a considerable proportion of the material cannot be reflected in the report. That is why we have developed the idea of preparing for the delegates and guests of the RUssian party conference reference and information material, in particular on the most characteristic remarks and proposals made by communist on all sections of the drafts of the Central Committee Platform and the CPSU Statutes and other questions.

Members on Conference

90UN1990A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 June 90 Single Edition p 5

[A. Gamov report on statements by members of the preparatory committee for the Russian Party Conference: "For Whom the Fortunes of Russia Are Dear"]

[Text] As is known, the March 1990 plenum of the party Central Committee deemed it advisable to convene a Russian party conference before the 28th CPSU Congress. The decree of the plenum that was adopted on this question established that the delegates to the conference

will be those who were elected from the party organizations of the Russian Federation to the 28th CPSU Congress. The Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee was charged with preparations for and the conduct of the conference. A preparatory committee was formed for these purposes from among representatives of kray, oblast, okrug, and Moscow City party organizations who were elected at plenums of corresponding party committees. The place and date for holding the Russian party conference were determined—Moscow, 19 June 1990.

The kinds of hopes that communists of the republics are placing on the all-Russian party forum, and the kind of work that is being conducted these days in the preparatory committee, its commissions, and working groups is discussed below by members of the preparatory committee of the Russian party conference who are delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress: V.I. Kutentsin, first secretary of the Ryazan Zheleznodorozhnyy Rayon party committee; M.A. Gasanov, metal worker-assembler of the Dagestan electric heating equipment plant; T.I. Kolesnikova, head of the political economy department of the Stavropol State Medical Institute; G.V. Sivets, secretary of the party committee of the production association "Izhevsk Mechanical Plant," and V.A. Likhobabin, head of the department of philosophy of the Khabarovsk higher party school.

[Kutentsin] I can with full justification assert that Russians are eagerly looking forward to the party conference, inasmuch as they associate a lot of things with it, pinning their hopes on further democratization of internal party life and the consolidation of party ranks. I had an opportunity to become convinced of this, when, after our first plenary meeting, I met in worker and educational auditoriums with participants in plenums of city and oblast party committees, where I had occasion to present information on how the conference preparations were proceeding. I think that the very great interest in the work of our committee is conditioned by the fact that from the very beginning we tried to take the activity of the commissions and groups outside the traditional "apparatus" framework. Today, each can do his bit in the preparations for the conference, and we, the members of the committee, are like the connecting links between the party mass and the heads of CPSU organs.

We have convinced ourselves more than once in our practical work that this approach is the only correct one. Take, for example, such a question as the formation of working organs of the conference—the presidium, the credentials committee, and so forth. If I were asked just two or three years ago whether it was worth engaging in this separately and with such concentration, I would have grinned and said: What difference does it make what kind of presidium there will be. Past reports and elections showed that the business mood of the conference depends on the first step, that is, on the formation of the presidium. Communists today will not accept "honorary presidiums." This must be a genuinely working body. Even the numerical makeup plays a very important role here. The same thing can also be said about other formations—about the secretariat and the credentials commission. I simply want to focus thinking on the fact that there can be no trivia in our work. And the seriousness with which my colleagues approach the examination of what appear to be the simplest questions cannot help but make one glad.

Our preparatory committee, its commissions, and its groups are guided in their work by the main task—the communists of Russia must come to the 28th CPSU Congress as a single and sufficiently united bloc. Despite the different movements that have surfaced recently, we must not be intimidated by any kinds of disagreements that might arise. The main body of communists supports perestroyka and those radical changes which are occurring in the CPSU. But in the process we must be somewhat concerned about the main thing—how to strengthen the party? There is now no talk about numerical composition. It is necessary to preserve and enrich the ideological base on which it is built—Marxism-Leninism. In the final analysis, it is necessary to define clearly the place of the party in the current situation.

[Sivets] The work in the commissions and groups these days is proceeding very intensely. This is associated with the great lack of time that arose because many of us had to be involved simultaneously both in the organization of elections to the Soviets and the conduct of reports and elections party conferences. Sometimes it is necessary to change things literally on the run. At the beginning, we worked in large groups, and now members of the preparatory committee are broken down into smaller groups, and specific organizational questions are being resolved.

When we analyzed the composition of the delegates who were elected to the congress of the party, it seemed that some social strata were very poorly represented. A substantial number of party functionaries were among the delegates, while only 7.9 percent of the delegates were workers and 2.8 percent were state farmers. And there were only 94 women—this is 4.6 percent of all of the delegates. It seems that this is unfair. That is why in the preparation of the list of those invited we are trying in some way to overcome this "imbalance." It is being proposed to invite to the conference workers, kolkhozniks [collective farmers], and representatives of the intelligentsia who are party organizers, secretaries of shop party organizations, or simply rank and file communists. Perhaps we should decide to grant them specific rights at the conference itself as well.

I think that it is time for us to establish close contacts with the delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress in order to prepare drafts of the conference agenda and its regulations in greater detail. With this approach, the delegates will come to the conference better prepared, and we will not have to spend valuable time on numerous procedural questions. Therefore, I would like to be so bold as to recommend to all of the delegates who are elected here

today, or who are still to be elected, and to all communists, to take part in the work of our preparatory committee. We await comments and alternative documents on one or another question. Or at least support and comradely participation.

[Kolesnikova] I want to address that provision of the draft CPSU Rules where it is proposed that our party and communists exert an influence on the resolution of economic and social tasks in the country. This is absolutely right. Ideological and personnel work cannot be the only sphere of our activity. Influence on the resolution of economic and social questions is an inalienable task of every communist, and of our entire party.

A very important place in the draft rules is held by the question of increasing the well-being of the people. The question concerns both social support and protection of the population during the transition to a regulated market economy. It seems to us that the people must understand clearly where their protection and guarantees are. I hope that a thorough discussion will be held on this score at the Russian party conference. Working on the staff of the preparatory committee, I intend to take part in generalizing those materials that were directed to the CPSU Central Committee on the draft of the party rules with the idea of taking into account the opinions of work collectives and party organizations in the preparation of the documents of our conference.

And one more thing. It is quite possible that our party conference can become a congress of the communists of the Russian Federation, for we cannot pass the formation of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation into the hands of people elected by chance or to place this responsibility on some kind of initiators. Delegates who are elected by party districts on a competitive basis and who have a mandate should elect the higher organs and establish the Russian Communist Party. Although, I think, we should not strike out the initiative of the Leningraders from our activist work.

[Sivets] The fact that members of the Leningrad organizational committee took part in our meeting yesterday attests to the fact that we are not departing from joint actions, but that we stand for a consolidation of all healthy forces in the party in order to preserve its unity. It can only be regretted that the Central Committee did not find it possible earlier to sit all of us at one "roundtable." I think that in the future we will work in closer contact with the Leningraders.

[Likhobabin] Today we see that a whole series of positions formed in Leningrad do not coincide with the position of the CPSU Central Committee contained in the draft platform for the 28th Party Congress. It is important today to learn the reasons for this divergence and to come to a mutual understanding. But it is necessary to do this on the basis of principles, on the basis of the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee. As for a positive evaluation of the Leningrad initiating congress, then here I agree that it played the unique role of a detonator, and in effect it brought the Central Committee and the Russian Bureau to the necessity now to resolve in a practical way the question of establishing a Russian Communist Party, as also being more adequate both for our statehood and for the very nature of the republic as a federated state. In a word, on questions of the creation of an RKP [Russian Communist Party], I am for unity and a constructive dialogue with everyone who is troubled by this problem. It seems in this connection that treatment in the press of the ideas of both the first Leningrad initiating congress and the second one being planned must be more thorough and objective. This will make it possible to remove misunderstandings that arise on the basis of rumors, conjectures, and to consolidate the efforts of everyone to whom the fortunes of Russia are dear.

[Gasanov] The plenum of the oblast party committee delegated me to the staff of the preparatory committee. I have frequently heard the question recently: What do I, as a representative of the working class, expect from the Russian party conference? The main thing is that the documents adopted both by the preparatory committee and the conference itself are not left on paper and that they are absolutely converted into real work. The people will follow us, the Russian Communists, only if they sense changes for the better in economic, political, and ideological directions.

At one of the meetings of the preparatory committee, one of my colleagues said that this kind of opinion exists among the people: As much as possible, ordinary people from the lathe and the plow must be brought on the staff of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, and as an approximation he cited two figures—45 percent in managerial organs should be workers and collective farmers. Perhaps one should not speak here of specific figures, but it is necessary to pay attention to this. I believe it is unfair when some say: But what can a worker or a peasant do in the RKP Central Committee that is useful? Apparently they are referring to our inadequate educational level, and to a lack of training and incompetence in these questions. But this is the main thing that should be taken into account: No matter what scientific potential one or another party document might contain, nonetheless, its true value can be determined by a worker and peasant and by the working people who carry on their shoulders the entire burden of both political and economic and even ideological problems.

And the main thing: I believe that the Russian Communist Party can become powerful and independent, if it will develop within the framework of the CPSU, and on the basis of its platform. I see no alternative here.

Moscow Party Conference Delegates View 'Split'

LD1406191790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The 28th conference of the Moscow party organization opened today. A total of 1,193 delegates out of the detachment of Moscow communists, which is over one million-strong, was selected to attend.

Comrades Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, Kryuchkov, and Yazov are delgates to the conference. Other members and candidate members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee are taking part in its work. [video shows correspondent Sergey Lomakin speaking to camera in lobby of conference hall]

[Lomakin] This information bulletin that was distributed to all delegates of the party conference sets out the positions of almost all the rayon party organizations at the 28th CPSU Congress. In point of fact there are no cardinal differences in them, but the views of the representatives of three blocs—the Democratic Platform, the Marxist Platform, and those members of the CPSU who support the platform of the CPSU Central Committee—remain opposed. Everything perhaps boils down to one thought that was expressed 70 years ago by Lenin—namely, that it is far more difficult to work in Moscow than in the provinces, since there is more bureaucracy, and there are more corrupt and selfish people at the top. [video shows delegates at conference; Yakovlev seated alongside Kryuchkov in hall; Ryzhkov on platform; Prokofyev at the rostrum; Medvedev, Zaykov and Razumovskiy seated together in the hall]

The conference began in an unusual way, with a proposal by a group of delegates that the agenda include the question of redistributing the property of the city's party organization, and instituting proceedings against former leaders of the Moscow city party committee for the errors committed by them in their work.

Prokofyev, first secretary of the city party committee, who delivered a report, analyzed the crisis in which the party finds itself. As he figuratively put it, the party has fallen into a pit of stagnation.

Delegates who spoke later in the debate particularly expressed alarm over the real split in the party, which must not be underestimated. It is not a slight chill, but indeed a heart attack. This is how the city party committee defined the problem. Considerable time was devoted to the coming constituent congress of the Russian Communist Party [CP]. [video shows interview with Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Presidential Council]

[Begin recording] [Lomakin] What place to you assign the Moscow city party organization within the framework of the Russian CP? Will it be a separate and independent party organization, or will it be at the level of the oblast?

[Yakovlev] It will of course occupy a special place. What kind of place will be shown, of course, by life. At present it occupies a special place without the creation of the Russian CP. This is quite natural. Nevertheless, it will be a kind of impetus-giving center for political life throughout the country, that is, a catalyst for some kinds of new ideas, and definitely a channel for some kinds of new party initiatives. This is inevitable. [end recording]

Yakovlev Interviewed

LD1506092590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Interview with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the party Central Committee, by correspondent Boris Simonov, at the Moscow CPSU Conference, date not given; introduced by journalist Irina Cherkova—recorded]

[Text] [Irina Cherkova] The conference of the city organization of the CPSU will continue its work in Moscow today. On the decision that will be made by the delegates—and they represent approximately 1.2 million CPSU members in the capital—on their assessment of the party's role in the conditions of perestroyka and the establishment of a multiparty system, will also depend, to a great extent, the course debates will take at the 28th CPSU Congress and its results.

The delegates to the Moscow party conference reflect the entire spectrum of platforms, points of view, and currents which exist in the country's public life.

Listen to an interview which was given to our special correspondent, Boris Simonov, by Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the Central Party Committee.

[Begin recording] [Simonov] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, you know the city party organization's stance. How do you regard it?

[Yakovlev] Well, it is a good stance. There it is up to the communists themselves whether they agree with this stance, or whether they do not agree with some stance or other, with some provision or other. But, in principle, you know, after all, what is important in a stance lies in the approach, in the trend. Where it pulls you: either forward, sideways, or whether it makes you mark time or perhaps pulls you back. Well, I see in this stance, nevertheless, a striving to advance, to go forward along the path of democratization of the party, along the path of organizing it in a way that is commensurate with the time. It, nevertheless, directs its attention toward communists and not toward some organizational structures. Until communists themselves begin to work sincerely, choose their stance, split up or unite, nothing will work. That is precisely it. We now are still struggling against ourselves. We have not completed our own struggle. We have forgotten ourselves what we were like five years ago. We have simply forgoten.

[Simonov] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, you have just started a very interesting conversation, about communists, about what they are about, about how they came to hold their current views. A Zil worker voiced the thought

that these 19 million are undeservedly being subjected to criticism, that they do not bear responsibility either for the repressions or for all kinds of errors perpetrated by the leaders.

[Yakovlev] This is both true and untrue. On the one hand, of course, Stalin and his entourage and their dogmas, inhumanity, crimes, and criminal psychology are to blame for the repressions. These are all facts. But, after all we, too, were around there somewhere. We could have refrained from doing bad things, could have, but we did them nevertheless. Well, in this respect, perhaps many people are to blame, including us. And, say, in a later period, in the stagnation period, so to speak: could the aftermath of the 1956 process, which had indeed begun, nevertheless have been defended by us? I think that somehow it could have. Even though the spirit of conservatism, the critical mass of conservatism stifled us of course. It can stifle us now, too. The very same thing is repeating itself. The very same thing that happened two or three years after 1956. The impulse is immense in everything Khrushchev was bold and courageous enough to stand up but got cold feet, got frightened of the democratic process. It seemed to him that everything was collapsing as it seems to us now that everything is collapsing. You understand, everything is repeating itself. Nothing is collapsing. Everything is proceeding in accordance with a normal process of democracy. And if we don't understand this, everything will indeed collapse. Let's return in thought to the year 1985, let's return to that—well, then everything will go to ruin, well then everything will go to ruin because the people will no longer put up with things. [end recording]

Moscow Party Appeals to Congress Delegates

90UN1999C Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 26 May 90 p 1

["Appeal of the Delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress and the 28th Conference of the Moscow City CPSU Organization—Participants in the Moscow Club of Delegates to the CPSU Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, Delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress and the Communists of the Country"]

[Text] Little time remains until the beginning of the 28th CPSU Congress. To our mind, an alarming situation has emerged associated with the absence of coordinated actions of the CPSU Central Committee and the corps of delegates on working out the drafts of the main documents of the congress. This will unavoidably bring about the disruption of the businesslike pace of work of the congress and the emergence of fruitless discussions.

The extraordinary nature of the forthcoming gathering compels new approaches to the participation of communists in the development of precongress documents.

In conjunction with this, we **propose** :

1. To create the All-Union Club of Delegates to the 28th Congress with regional clubs of deputies in the field and a unified coordinating center.

2. To assign members of the Central Committee commission for preparing draft documents of the congress to the coordinating center of the club in order to organize joint work. To recommend that the commission be expanded by adding members of the club of delegates.

3. To hold a discussion on the draft documents being prepared by the CPSU Central Committee commission for the congress at the All-Union Club of Delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress.

To consider expedient their advance publication for the purpose of the extensive familiarization of all communists with them.

4. To provide space in the newspaper PRAVDA and other party publications for the continuous publication of remarks and proposals on the draft precongress documents by the All-Union Club.

Moscow Committees Prepare for CPSU Congress

90UN2045A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 May 90 p 2

[Article by M. Grodnitskaya and I. Kosarev: "Exact Forecasting Versus Stereotypes]

[Text] **Last Saturday, 11 Moscow rayons held rayon party conferences. With a commonality of problems, they differed in form. Each rayon itself chose the form that was most suitable to it.**

A phase of preparations for the party congress that is unprecedented in its character and tasks is coming to a close. This phase is possibly the most complicated. Various sides have been heard, and a host of ideas and proposals were stated on questions that either were not considered at all before, or were simply not raised for lack of public necessity. And now all of these currents have to be brought together in a single channel.

Today, the consensus, as it is now the custom to say, but speaking simply, the agreement, is achieved on the level of Moscow rayons. The pre-congress documents are being worked on in the rayon party organizations. And the party organizations are different. In composition: In some places industrial enterprises predominate, and in others, artistic collectives. In some places the intellectual level of discussion is higher, and in others it is lower. But in principle, the range of problems is approximately the same. At the center of attention is the transition to a market economy, preservation of the unity of the party or fixing the boundaries of the platform, the creation of factions, the building of the party, and so forth. In previous issues, the newspaper has already treated the main differences on these points. We would like to note other features that could be heard at conferences at the end of last week.

Thus, speaking from the rostrum of the Sverdlovskiy Rayon conference, V. Solovyev, department editor of the newspaper SELSKAYA ZHIZN, asked those assembled the question: And what specifically do we offer Communists and nonparty members in order to solve their daily living problems, let us say, even on a rayon level? Will they understand us with our theoretical, global reflections and arguments about socialist ideals? Perhaps this remark can be extended to all positions and platforms that are being developed. There is a certain tendency to be "lofty"—and an unwillingness or inability to reason out specific actions.

One of the speakers noted something else: Regardless of which way our political views tend, to the right or the left, we suffer from incompetence. But A. Sokhatskiy, a representative from the Rayon Administration of Internal Affairs, also found one of the typical weak spots in all of the proposed documents. They proceed from today's and even yesterday's realities. But they lack the element of political forecasting. We talk about ideal matters: about communism and socialism, but we coordinate them poorly with the data of public opinion polls and the study of trends in societal development. As a matter of fact, all of these features should be interrelated: scientific analysis—an outline of reference points—and the development of specific steps. In one way or another, the speakers at the conference formed this linkage.

In talking about the past conferences, we cannot help but mention a speech we heard at the Khoroshevskaya party conference, which was one of the first in the city. It was that of O. Latsis, a delegate to the congress.

Perhaps to someone in the hall the speech seemed "out of order," because Latsis actually spoke in support of a candidate after consideration of the candidates was stopped. And still...

The speech was about G. Krauze, director of Automobile Combine No 1. He is well known in Moscow. At one time, a lot was written, and effusively, about his "model enterprise." And—deservedly. This person worked conscientiously all of his life, and he did his job. And in his speech he called for the same thing—to be disciplined and to work. You will agree that today a speaker with these positions is automatically classified as a conservative. But Latsis contributed the vital change in the picture of this elderly person. He came out on the rostrum and recalled how a quarter of a century ago, together with Krauze they began this "Kosygin" reform. How the automobile combine was one of five enterprises in the whole Union that participated in working through the experiment. And how at that time clouds started to gather over Krauze because of his excessive independence, and the workers of the combine called a strike. They said that they would conduct it on Staraya Ploshchad, arriving there not on just anything but on flatbed trucks. Kirilenko arrived in quick order at the combine and convinced the workers not to do this. In exchange, he promised that nothing would happen to their Krauze. "So," concluded Otto Rudolfovich, "to come out on the rostrum and rattle off for all of the newspapers what you think about communism and about the president can be done by most people. But to judge people according to their deeds is more reliable."

And we think that if, in the intermission after this, the conference participants could have seen how two weary persons met each other with the words: "Do you remember, then, you do remember?", and they embraced, I think they would not be angry at the unscheduled speech. They would simply have become convinced with new strength that it is today that we must take the boldest steps and fearlessly pursue radical changes in all spheres—and in internal party affairs also.

...The party conference of the Sokolnicheskiy Rayon made it its task to consider the position of the rayon party organization on the forthcoming CPSU Congress. The report of V. Ilyina, first secretary of the rayon party committee (recently elected chairman of the rayon soviet of people's deputies), and the first speeches in the debates, immediately raised the discussion to a principled and rather high level. The objective that the delegates pursued, after allowing delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress elected in the rayon to speak first in the debates, was achieved. It will probably be superfluous to talk about what kind of a difficult pre-election marathon these communists had to go through. Only outstanding people who had a personal point of view and who could defend it in a well-reasoned way were trusted to become delegates to the congress.

The positions and views on restructuring the party that the delegates of the congress espoused were very different from each other.

For example, in his speech V. Mironov, a social science teacher and delegate to the congress, convinced the delegates to transform the position of the party organization to the side of the basic principles of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU.

K. Makarov, the secretary of the party committee of the production association of main postal transportation and a delegate to the congress, proposed a program of radical restructuring of the leading organs of the CPSU, including a reduction in administrative sections.

A. Kulikov, the chief of the Rayon Administration of Internal Affairs, who was elected from among those who live in the rayon, concentrated principal attention on the situation regarding transgressions of the law in the rayon and proposed a plan for rayon party organization participation in correcting the crime-conducive situation. In general, there were a lot of proposals, and all of them were different. And all of this made the work of the conference constructive and thorough.

In accepting the final version of the position of the rayon party organization, the delegates made many changes and additions to it. In particular, addressing the CPSU Central Committee, the conference demanded that the new version of the CPSU Platform be published before

the congress, after including in the text changes which a majority of the Communists of the country are insisting on.

In conclusion, apparently, it should be said that despite the commonality of the problems considered the conferences differed in form. Each rayon chose the one that was most suitable to it. The Kuntsevskiy Rayon held a full-scale report-election conference, as the saying goes. (Incidentally, it has not ended yet.) A report conference was held in the Sevastopolskiy Rayon, but it was decided to hold the elections after the congress. In the Sokolnicheskiy, Babushkinskiy, Kirovskiy, Krasnogvardeyskiy, and Pervomayskiy rayons, by-elections of delegates were held at the conferences (today the total number of delegates to the congress is 238, and to the city party conference, 914). In some rayons—Sevastopolskiy, Timiryazevskiy, Babushkinskiy, and Sverdlovskiy—the participants of the conference made a proposal on the composition of the central organs of the party. Discussions were also stormy in Dzerzhinskiy and Solntsevskiy Rayons. Here and there literally each provision of the document submitted for approval was put to a vote.

Moscow Plenum Resolution on Market Transition

90UN2004A Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 31 May 90 p 1

["Resolution of the 30 May 1990 CPSU Moscow City Committee Plenum in Conjunction With the Concept of a Transition to a Regulated Market Economy Proposed by the Government"]

[Text] The CPSU MGK [Moscow City Committee] notes that the decision on a transition to market relations which influences the future of the country and affects the interests of all strata of the population, of every citizen, cannot be made without a discussion by the people and representatives of public organizations and social currents.

In conjunction with this, the CPSU MGK Plenum is of the opinion that the final decision on the issue of our transition to a regulated market in stages may be made after an all-people's referendum is held. The issue of our transition to market relations should be considered at the 28th CPSU Congress.

Moscow CPSU Chief on Alarm, Hope in Party

LD1406104690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] And now a report from the hall where the Moscow city conference of the CPSU is in session.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent A. Onosovskiy] One thousand one hundred and ninety-three delegates are representing the capital's 1.14 million communists. It has been decided to hold the conference in two stages. The pre-congress documents will be worked out in the first, and it is intended to hold the second after the completion of the 28th CPSU Congress. The delegates have adopted the agenda, discussed the rules, and elected credentials and drafting commissions. Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU, read a report on the position of the Moscow city party organization on the CPSU draft statutes. He said, in part:

[Prokofyev] Alarm and hope: Probably this is how the state of the party can be described on the even of its congress. Communists are alarmed about the country's future and the political fate of the party itself. Their hopes are currently linked to the fundamental renewal of socialism and the radical democratization of the CPSU. It is hard to realize how vast are the changes of the crisis in society which have gripped its economy, politics, social and cultural spheres and people's morality. There is no one at present with whom the party can share responsibility for the deformations of the socialist idea and practice which did not allow worthy living conditions to be created for the Soviet person. By becoming a part of the administrative-command system, removing its political opponents and inculcating ideological uniformity, the party, speaking figuratively, has fallen into a pit of stagnation. The very arduous task of getting out of this pit has fallen upon the present generation of party members. This cannot be done by clutching at dead dogmas or by attempting to leap out in one bound. It is futile to hope that someone will stretch out a hand from above. A wave of public dissatisfaction has washed anti-communist forces into the political arena. Calls for the party to be wound up are being heard openly. Communists are already experiencing psychological pressure.

[Onosovskiy] Briefly, here are some of the other problems that the speaker touched upon: The draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th party congress, although it is a document that has given rise to sharp criticism, has at the same time provided a stimulus for the functioning of creative thinking in the party. The position of the Moscow city party organization has absorbed a diversity of points of view which were expressed in the course of the discussions at party organizations during the debate on this document in the delegates' club, in commissions, at the bureau and at plenums of the city committee and in the press. A major part of the report was devoted to economic problems. The government's program for a transition to a market economy was subjected to critical analysis. Then the debates began.

Taking part in the conference are Comrades Ryzhkov, Medvedev, Baklanov, Zaykov, Razumovskiy, Kryuchkov, Yakovlev, Primakov and other party leaders. [video shows auditorium, Prokofyev at rostrum; Ryzhkov, Medvedev, Zaykov, Yakovlev, Kryuchkov, Primakov seen in auditorium] [end recording]

Russian City Cuts Party Structure, Apparatus

PM1206160590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p2

[Dispatch by correspondent A. Dergachev: "Decision To Abolish Rayon Party Committees"]

[Text] Novorossiysk—For three months communists in the city's primary party organizations have been discussing the possibility of abolishing raykoms [rayon party committees] and changing the functions and composition of the gorkom [city party committee] apparatus.

The results of this referendum have been summed up by a plenum, which largely approved the new structure for the city party organization: It has been decided to abolish the raykoms as of 1 July, thereby halving the party apparatus staff. Whereas, for example, the party gorkom and raykoms currently have a staff of 99 people; the new gorkom apparatus will consist of 47 members of staff, making an annual wage saving of more than R215,000. In view of the fact that, under the new conditions, the CPSU gorkom will also engage in commercial activity, it is proposed to introduce a new position: inspector for commerce.

The question of how to use the raykom personnel released from their duties has yet to be decided.

Moscow Rally Supports Baltic Independence

LD1406135690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] A report came in from Moscow that in solidarity with the day of hope and mourning which is being held in Lithuania, today, 14 June, a mass rally in support of independence for the three Baltic republics was organized by a public group called Russia-Lithuania in Gorkiy Park.

The 50th anniversary of occupation and forceful annexation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the Soviet Union was commemorated at the meeting.

Western Republics

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Convenes 14 Jun

Court Staffing on Agenda

LD1406223590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Moldavian Supreme Soviet session: Here is our special correspondent Gennadiy Klimov:

[Klimov, over video of session in progress] Today some deputies from the Soviet Moldavia group are back in their seats after a three-week break. The change of mood among the deputies who boycotted the session is related to the decision adopted yesterday by the Supreme Soviet on measures to ensure the immunity of the republic's people's deputies and local soviets. The question on the agenda of the session—the confirmation of the staff of city and rayon courts—was considered from two viewpoints. One argument was that nationality should be a factor in the choice of judges and that their numbers should be proportional to the ethnic makeup of the population, and the other was primarily based upon the belief that the knowledge of the state language of Moldavia should be a mandatory condition in confirming a judge in his post. For some candidate judges, this condition has become a stumbling block despite the fact that their professional competence is not an object of any doubt. [video shows Klimov addressing Arsenin—captioned as chairman of standing commission for ethnic questions]

[Kumov] Have you reached any agreement with the Soviet Moldavia group of deputies?

[Arsenin] There are many issues on which we have found a common language. I think that in the long run we will be able to reach appropriate agreement. As to fundamental issues, everyone has the right to his own view and we are only pleased that people can stand up for their views. What is involved here once again is the absence of parliamentary experience which has led to these undesirable consequences.

'Stalemate' at Session

LD1406082890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1609 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Kishinev, June 13 (TASS)—Atem-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Tkhorov reports:

A stalemate has taken shape at the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session, which resumed proceedings today. After the second round, the deputies have still failed to elect the chairman of the standing commission for problems of youth; the elections started three weeks ago now. [passage omitted]

Despite some obvious shortcomings in the work of the session, certain progress has also been made. In recent days the coordinating commission of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet has been at work; it is holding talks with the deputies of the "Soviet Moldavia" group who have walked out of the congress hall. By today it has been possible for them to reach consensus on many issues, and there is hope that in the very near future the full membership will take part in the session.

Law on State Symbols Passed

LD0706113890 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 7 Jun 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Excerpt] A law on introducing additions to the republic's code of criminal and legal proceedings was adopted

at the session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet. According to this law, persons and organiztions that do not observe state symbols will be punished by a fine on a scale up to R10,000 or will be subjected to imprisonment. In the view of an INTERFAX correspondent, this law is directed, first and foremost, against leaders of towns with a Russian-speaking population who do not accept Moldavia's new state symbols. [passage omitted]

Further on 12th Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Session

'Democratic Bloc' Makes Statement

PM0706092990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov: "Left Only in Order To Remain?"]

[Text] Kiev, 6 Jun—This morning people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] began discussing candidacies for the posts of deputy chairmen of the republic Supreme Soviet. A spokesman for the "democratic bloc" made an ultimatum-like statement. He declared that its members are going over to the parliamentary opposition and refusing to participate in elections and will set up an alternative people's council.

Nevertheless, in accordance with the powers granted him, V.A. Ivashko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, named three candidates for the post of first deputy chairman—I. Plyushch, V. Khomenko, and V. Durdynts—and for the post of deputy chairman: I. Yukhnovskiy, V. Grinev, and A. Yemets. Representatives of the "democratic bloc" are not participating in the elections. However, they raised questions and mounted the rostrum almost more frequently than those present [as published].

'Opposition' Tactics Deplored

PM0806113190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent S. Tsikora dispatch under the rubric "Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Session": "Opposition Names Its Leader"]

[Text] Kiev—The glimmer of hope that mutual understanding between the factions in the Ukrainian parliament would come with the election of the new head of the republic was unfortunately dashed at the very first sitting. Although deputies dealt with the next item on the agenda—the first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet was finally elected—apart from this gratifying result in the session's work a far less pleasing fact had to be noted: the official birth of real parliamentary opposition in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

Events developed as follows. Addressing the morning sitting, V. Ivashko, chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet, informed deputies that a sitting of the conference commission [soglasitelnaya komissiya] lasting several hours had nevertheless failed to resolve the problem of how many deputies the chairman should have: two, as under the existing constitution, or three, which would be more in line with current requirements. The head of the republic himself inclined toward the opinion that there should be three and, moreover, that one position should definitely be reserved for a representative of the minority among the deputies. But the idea of three deputy chairmen did not find support when the vote was cast.

Then V. Ivashko named the candidates for the posts of first deputy and deputy chairman whom he submitted for approval. The list included the names of representatives of the minority, for whom a post of deputy head of the republic had been reserved.

The response to this proposal was a sharply worded statement by representatives of the Democratic Bloc in the Ukrainian parliament. It amounted to saying that the proposed distribution of "portfolios" in the Supreme Soviet did not reflect the real arrangement of political forces outside the walls of the sessions hall. Here we are in the minority, one representative of the emerging opposition said, but we do in fact represent the majority of the republic's people. Consequently, the Democratic Bloc is taking up the position of a constructive parliamentary opposition, which is being registered in the people's soviet.

Its main task, the statement said, will be to draft its own decisions and draft laws, including alternative versions. As is usual for opposition members, they are refusing in advance to participate in any leading bodies of the Supreme Soviet above the level of its standing commissions and will not have any representatives in the republic's government either. Moreover, the statement continued, the Democratic Bloc reserves the right to "propagandize ideas of dissolving the Supreme Soviet in the Ukraine and holding new, democratic elections on the basis of political pluralism."

Opposition deputies named as head of the "shadow parliament" Igor Rafailovich Yukhnovskiy, a physicist of world renown, CPSU member, participant in the Great Patriotic War, delegate to the 19th party conference, and academician of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences.

The session was forced to elect the first deputy head of the republic without the participation of more than 100 opposition deputies, who refused to take part in the vote. Alternative elections were conducted in two rounds: 49-year-old Ivan Stepanovich Plyushch, hitherto chairman of the Kiev Oblast Soviet Executive Committee, was elected first deputy chairman.

Ivashko Discusses Federation

LD1406131290 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] We've got a report on the first session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet of the 12th convocation

tonight. In the morning Vladimir Ivashko, chairman of the Ukrainian parliament, made a report on the results of his visit to Moscow, where he took part in the sitting of the USSR Council of the Federation. In his report Vladimir Ivashko underlined the tendency to reforms in relations between the Soviet republics. In part Vladimir Ivashko said the following.

The president of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev, started the sitting speaking about some philosophical, political and practical aspects of a new federation, said Vladimir Ivashko. The processes to create a new federation are already on the way and they are started, as it should be, on the initiative of masses. This process is quite different for various republics. But they cast one question: What kind of federation it should be? Where shall we go, and what shall we do?

Mikhail Gorbachev, continued Vladimir Ivashko, pulled out a concept of creation of a union of sovereign socialist states. There are many viewpoints among people on this concept. The talk is about the creation of a new union which will be, I should say, two-storey building. The republic as sovereign state will identify its sovereign (?function), sovereign responsibility which they pass to the Union. This is the first stage. The second stage is establishment of direct links, treaties, agreements between the republics on this or that basis, said Vladimir Ivashko.

In part Vladimir Ivashko stressed the reasons why those processes of creation of a new federation are to be expedited. He explained it as a need to overcome a number of problems existing since the time of stagnation in the economy, political and social spheres, wich evoked problems in interethnic relations in some regions of the Soviet Union.

The chairman of the Ukrainian parliament, Vladimir Ivashko, shared his viewpoints on current difficulties faced by Soviet economy. The current situation in our economy is that command methods of management have really failed to accomplish anything, and market economy still is not ready to work in the way it was planned. That is why there are many problems, such as escalating inflation, for example. In previous years we were not managed [as heard] to break power of apparatus dictatorship as a consisting part of a command-administrative system. The new federation has to be based on market economy, on new relations between republics.

Vladimir Ivashko continued: The new market cannot be created without new relations between republics, without every republic having its possibilities estimated in getting out of the previous system, because it is quite a difference to have three fourths of heavy industry, or to have 40 percent of such industry. That's why all those relations of market economy are to be built. They must have judicial, methodic, financial basis in correspondence with Union republics who might pull out their own proposals, alternatives due to interests of the population of the republics.

Then Vladimir Ivashko pointed out problems which will appear at the transition to market economy, and in this case (?some means) of compensation are to be worked out. Here is what he said in this connection: The price raise on certain products doesn't mean that prices on other products remain steady. We see it even now. There was only talk about rising prices on bread and related products, but meat in various districts of the country became expensive. So when we talk about compensation, it would be an economic mistake to think that if you pay an extra five rubles for bread, it would not mean that these R5 is to be compensated: it means that the compensation [word indistinct] must be a bit higher.

In the way Vladimir Ivashko called the members of the parliament to start working over the declaration about political and economic sovereignty of the Ukraine. People's deputies already have worked out a draft of such a document, and they have to discuss it now. Vladimir Ivashko pointed out that this draft could be a basic document in working out by members of the parliament of main principles of the national independence of the Ukraine as part of the Soviet Union.

Language Question Resolved

LD1406165690 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Excerpts] An unexpected problem has arisen. At today's morning session of the republic's Supreme Soviet the deputies were compelled to tackle the question: What language the session's chairman has to use in conducting the sitting; Ukrainian, which is the state language on the territory of Ukraine, or Russian, which is the language of interethnic relations.

The problem arose for a good reason. Volodymyr Grinev, who chaired the proceedings for the first time this morning, is only gaining initial experience as deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet. In addition, he is Russian, and for various reasons his knowledge of Ukrainian is insufficient. Therefore, addressing the session, he asked them for permission to conduct proceedings in Russian.

The request aroused a diverse response. Roman Lubkivskiy, deputy from Lvov oblast, was the first to speak. Addressing the chairman, he said:

[Begin Lubkivskiy recording] I ask you, esteemed Mr. Chairman, to conduct the session in the state language. You have stated that your attitude to this language is tolerant. You have also demonstrated a good knowledge of Ukrainian when reading official statements. Please conduct the session in Ukrainian. That is, in the state language on the territory of Ukraine. [end recording]

Deputy Iryna Kalynets, also from Lvov Oblast, supported this sentiment. [passage omitted]

The situation, which was becoming more acute, was discharged by Deputy Pavlychko, from Ivano-Frankovsk, who urged his colleagues to display tolerance and to respect each other. He continued:

[Begin Pavlychko recording] I have chatted with Grinev many times. His knowledge of Ukrainian is quite sufficient for conducting the session in Ukrainian. I appeal to you, dear Volodymyr Borysovych, not to stage this precedent because such a move will lead us once again into a blind alley. [end recording]

After these exchanges, Volodymyr Grinev conducted the session in Ukrainian.

Ukraine Central Committee Discusses Congress

LD1406040690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum was held today. It considered issues concerning the next 28th congress of the republic's Communist Party. The plenum ratified the Central Committee's report-back on the political situation and the main directions in the activity of the Ukrainian Communist Party at the present stage and other documents submitted to the congress. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee spoke at the plenum.

Ukrainian Party Obkom Secretaries Elected

LD0706220590 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 30 May 90 p 2

[Summary] Conferences of party oblast organizations completed their work in Khmelnitskiy, Vinnitsa, Zhitomir, Lugansk, Nikolayev, and Lutsk (Volynian Oblast). First secretaries of these party obkoms [oblast party committees] were elected.

In Khmelnitskiy: V.I. Kupratyy, formerly second secretary, was elected first secretary of the party oblast committee.

In Vinnitsa: A.P. Nekhayevskiy was elected first secretary once again.

In Zhitomir: V.G. Fedorov reelected as first secretary.

Lugansk (formerly Voroshilovgrad): A.I. Onishchenko, formerly first secretary of the Krasnyy Luch Gorkom [city party committee], was elected first secretary of the party oblast committee.

In Nikolayev: I.I. Gritsay, up till then chairman of the oblast soviet, was elected first secretary of the party obkom.

In Lutsk: V.I. Blazhenchuk, second secretary and chairman of the oblast soviet, was elected first secretary of the Volynian party oblast committee.

Ukrainian Komsomol Votes To Change Name

LD1406215390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1245 GMT 14 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Boychenko and Marina Tarnavskaya]

[Excerpt] Kiev, 14 Jun—The majority of delegates to the latest congress of the Ukrainian Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol], which today finished work in Kiev, has voted for a new name for their organization. Now it is called the Ukrainian Leninist Communist Youth League (Youth for Democratic Socialism) [LKSMU (MDS), or Leninskiy Kommunisticheskiy Soyuz Molodezhi Ukrainy (Molodezh za Demokraticheskiy Sotsializm)] [passage omitted]

Chernobyl-Related Strike Committee Formed

90UN1974A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 17 May 90 p 3

[Article by SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA correspondent A. Gotovchits: "The Surrounded City (Or Why Gomel Needs An All-City Strike Committee)"]

[Text] This committee was created on 12 May at the conference for representatives of strike committees and workers which took place in the House of Culture of the Gomselmash association. Two of the three elected cochairmen of the committee—A. Bukhvostov and E. Murashko—represent the Gomselmash and the third one—S. Bondarenko—represents the machine tool manufacturing plant imeni Kirov. Basically, all major enterprises and construction organizations of this oblast center became the founders of the committee as they sent their delegates to the conference. The unstable balance in the city has been disturbed. Considering that the workers' representatives from Rechitsa, Narovlya, Mozyr, and Svetlogorsk were also present at the conference, one can be sure that soon the entire oblast and not only the workers of Gomel will become links of a single chain and the strike committee will have the ends of the chain in their hands.

It was the Chernobyl trouble that forced the people to unite in the extraordinary committee. Or, to be more precise, it was the four-year long inactivity of the republic government and the local authorities with respect to the people living in the areas where the contamination level was less than five curie units per square kilometer.

The disaster considerably changed the conditions of life and work for the people in these areas. The ecological situation, which had been unhealthy before, deteriorated even more. If you just look at the map of the radioactive fallout you will see clearly that the oblast center became

surrounded by "dead zones" with no uncontaminated lands. And the city itself suffered too.

I have here the results of radiation tests conducted in the Volotov microrayon. The paper is signed by the deputy manager of the Gomel hydrometeorology center, A. Klimenko. The volume of the exposure doses in various locations varies from 0.012 to 0.4 milliroentgen per hour.

The chairman of the Bridge Constructing Team No. 88 strike committee, V. Plyushch, reported to the conference on the results of the measurements done on the territory of School No. 45. The gamma background there is as high as 0.210 milliroentgen per hour, which is about ten times higher than the natural radiation. And this is an entirely different microrayon of the city.

To this we should add the foods which contain radio nuclides of cesium and strontium. Let us not forget also the increase in respiratory, digestive, and thyroid diseases among adults and children. So, contrary to the officials insisting that "everything is normal," Gomel is rather far from being a kind of paradise miraculously spared by the Chernobyl disaster.

And if such is the state of affairs, then the people of Gomel asked a legitimate question: What is being done to decrease the radiation doses, to make living there safe, and to improve the environment?

There was no answer to this question nor were there answers to others. The state program on the elimination of the Chernobyl disaster aftereffects in the republic specifies that food supplies in the city will comply with medical norms as of 1991; the health care and public and everyday services should be raised to the standard level even later—by the end of the next five-year period. Thus, in the four years after the disaster the people in the city did not sense any real concern for them.

Here is what the resolution of the conference of strike committee representatives says about this: the majority of the decisions made by the authorities are not being made public, are contradictory in many ways, and all of them are based on a single concept—to use a minimum of benefits to keep people in contaminated areas.

No practical measures are visible, complete information is not available, and the people are concerned about the future of their children. All of this has heated the sociopsychological situation to boiling point.

After the city was already in a tumult, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers adopted decisions answering some of the questions concerning the people of Gomel. But Gomel residents cannot be completely sure that the planned measures will be fully realized in the outlined periods of time. They are guided in their lack of faith by the blind coordination among the state organs and their secretiveness about the available information, as well as the by the indifferent and disinterested attitude of some managers in administrative and other organs. And this results in a loss of trust in the political leadership of the republic.

All this led to the arguments that arose in some places between workers and their administration—arguments over additional health care payments. In other places the arguments involved the leadership of the oblast, republic, and even the entire country.

On 26 April the 33,000 employees of the Gomselmash association conducted a one-day strike. They explained that they could not wait any longer for an answer to their demands. They had asked the authorities to improve the supply of uncontaminated foods to the city, to provide better medical help to adults and children, and to pay them compensation for the damage to the people's health. The association workers were supported by the employees of the machine tool manufacturing plant imeni Kirov. Strike committees were formed in many other enterprises and the coordination council started to prepare a conference.

It is obvious that the tension did not lessen after the visit to the city by E. Sokolov and A. Kamay, first and second secretaries of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee. While a meeting was taking place there the people picketed the building of the obkom [oblast party committee], holding up sticks with liver sausages on them to show their indignation at the city food supplies.

I must say that in early May the government of the republic did make an attempt to change their previous view of the situation in the contaminated areas. V. Kebich, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, took part in the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] meeting which adopted a protocol of emergency measures. Among other things it suggests that starting 1 July of this year the people of Gomel are to be provided with food according to the medical food consumption norms for areas with contamination of 1 curie unit per square kilometer and higher. Certain measures are planned to improve medical aid and care for adults and children. But this is just a protocol which has not yet been signed or made public.

But the people believe only in practical measures which they can feel for themselves. Such measures have not yet been seen. That was the reason why indignation was the main theme of many speeches: enough begging and pleading which verge on humiliation.

The chairman of the Gomselmash trade union committee, A. Bukhvostov, even tends to think that the strike movement was brought about by the fact that "the officials do not wish to talk to the workers as their equals."

"We are creating an organization today," said E. Kosykh on the purpose of the strike committee, "which will be able to control and direct the authorities as well as force them to resolve problems as the population desires."

"The authorities are afraid of the organized workers' movement," insisted I. Kovalev of the Gomselmash. He came to such a conclusion after reading the appeal in the local paper by the obkom bureau, the oblispolkom, and the oblast council of trade unions to Communists and all people of the city. A similar appeal to show restraint was found in the leaflets put in the mailboxes the day before the conference.

I must say that People's Deputies Yu. Voronezhtsev and V. Korniyenko did not share in the attempt to consider strikes as the only method of resolving our current problems. For that they were criticized. The protocol of the 5 May meeting in the Gomel oblispolkom contains 21 demands. Among others it mentions announcing Gomel a zone of ecological disaster and providing certain payments with an added regional coefficient to the residents of the area. The conference demanded that the retirement age for men and women be lowered by five years; they want to increase the annual leave for those employed by two weeks and to extend to three years the partially paid maternity leave with compensation payments for a minimum of unused time. As during the Gomselmash strike, the conference mentioned the food supply problems, the need for a regular and complete medical examination of the people, and for improving the people's health.

As a separate issue the conference noted the need to design as early as this year a plan to transfer Gomel oblast into a free economic zone. The purpose of this is to create a regional fund to expedite the realization of the program to minimize the aftereffects of the nuclear power station disaster.

The rationality of the demands is obvious, with the exception of one or two items—for instance, banning all construction in areas with one curie unit per square kilometer which would include Gomel. Hopefully the demands will be received according to their addressees: by the USSR president and the governments of our country and republic. The only thing that was not really discussed at the conference was the question: where will we find the necessary finances, materials, equipment, and food? But, as they say, this is a concern of the highest organs of power whom we elect and support by our work. It is not the people of Gomel who are to blame for the radioactive ring that encircled them.

Deputy Premier Describes Coalfield Improvements

PM0806105990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Correspondent Nikolay Lisovenko dispatch under the rubric "Direct Line": "In the Miners' Interests"]

[Text] Donetsk—The Donbass miners are discussing the results of the work done by the government commission under the leadership of L.D. Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

For everyone gathered in the building of the former Ukrainian Ministry of the Coal Industry for the commission's final session, the most important question was certainly the one put by miner Aleksandr Kolomiytsev to L.D. Ryabev: What can I tell the workers about progress in implementing Resolution No. 608?

L.D. Ryabev replied: Tell them that we have produced many important documents together, that 30 of the 47 points in last year's agreement have been implemented, and that a major program, costing R4 billion, is going to be adopted for the social development of mining towns and settlements in the Ukraine. Surely these are quite considerable achievements?

Much has been done, of course. The question of giving mines economic independence has been resolved, the coal main administration in Donetsk has been abolished, miners now receive bonuses for evening and night work and also for traveling time to and from the coal face, the Law on Pensions has been adopted essentially in the form proposed by the miners, the Supreme Soviet will soon be discussing the draft Law on Leave for Miners submitted by L.D. Ryabev's commission, and measures have been outlined on a new system for setting coal prices, on developing export trade, and on improving the sector's provision with vehicles, machinery, and spares as well as scarce timber and construction materials. During the sessions, senior ministry and department officials received instructions concerning pipes, cement, and water supplies.

The "Program for the Social Development of Mining Towns and Settlements," which forms a whole section of its own in Resolution 608, envisages considerable development of the public health care network.

Ukraine Broadcasters Protest Censorship

LD1406121690 Kiev Literaturna Ukraina in Ukrainian 7 Jun 90 p 4

[Open letter from Ukrainian TV and radio workers to Ukrainian SSR people's deputies: "We Have No Wish To Be TV and Radio Conservatives]

[Text] We are working in a system which cannot be compared with anything. Its "uniqueness" lies primarily in the complete monopoly on TV and radio broadcasting in the republic and in the flat refusal to have any alternatives or rivals. The state television and radio committee continues to autocratically retain the right of information, the shaping of artistic tastes, and the forming of public opinion through TV and radio broadcasts. And, as you yourself know only too well, this gigantic monopolism does not allow the truth to reach the TV screen or the ether. Even now, as if to please various supervising organs, we generously feed the people with half-truths and blot out all sorts of events which is almost tantamount to telling lies.

We are ashamed that in those historically decisive moments in the life of our people, the lips of nomenclatura officials of the Gosteleradio and of other mercenaries have deceived the millions of people, showing them not what was happening but what was ordered. Suffice it to recall 1986 and the Chernobyl spring: the coverage of the May Day demonstration under the lethal winds, the merry faces of those who were being deceived and the sour looks of those who were committing deception, at the same time waving from the government stand to the passing columns of working people. We were instructed to cover all stages of the peace cycle race and to show the smiling faces of sportsmen, viewers, and children—those children whom nobody contemplated evacuating as far as possible from the nuclear epidemic. And how many times was the screen of Ukrainian TV used by minister Romanenko for deceiving the Ukrainian people, a person whose primary duty it was to raise the alarm! And how many other liars were given TV time for similar purposes! The history of these years must be shown as it was, and those who tried to fit it to their own outlook should now get what they deserve.

We are ashamed by those TV and radio attacks against Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka], a people's movement for restructuring. Just think: the state TV network ardently tried to rout a people's movement! Still, many of you—people's deputies—could yourselves witness those "equal" possibilities of getting TV time during the election campaign.

Ukrainian television, thoroughly ideologized and straight-jacketed by the dogmas of radio broadcasting, has virtually lost the trust of the citizens of the Ukraine. Within our system they never trusted professionals and talented people and still continue that way. The selection of cadres is slanted in such a way that only obedient time-servers who are ideologically devoted are favored. Our leaders assume that "exceptionally wise" people bring only trouble. Can one then wonder that all programs, if they are even slightly bold or true, are bound to perish under the scissors of "censors" and "managers"? It is a fact that the main function of our managers is to be political censors. The latest victims of this anachronism were the live TV program "Trust" and the radio program "Three Colors," whose producers treated calls for glasnost and freedom of speech "too literally." It seems that they prefer to follow the French proverb: "To get rid of dandruff, resort to the guillotine." Their attitude to various informal and creative organizations is still cautious and prejudiced.

But can it be otherwise since our management is completely dependent on the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee? Even more, it does not display the slightest desire to get rid of the "sweet yoke" of the ideology department of the central committee which has in fact turned the Gosteleradio into a branch of its own. But wait: television and radio here belong to the state, not to parties. Well, in the building on Ordzhonikidze Street they think otherwise.

No, we are not against the party as such. We are in favor of a multiparty system in our society and for television and radio free of party interference. We favor professionalism in the TV and radio sectors, both of which should work for the people and satisfy its right for objective information instead of being servants of the Central Committee. To achieve this, both TV and radio should be run by professionals and not by former party functionaries. We appeal to you, esteemed deputies, to display appropriate attention to the most powerful means of mass information. What is needed is a creation by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet of a commission which would work out rules or theses on the state committee for TV and radio broadcasting acting as sovereign national television and radio broadcasting. And only this commission, and no other body, should control the work of our Gostelradio and defend it from those who out of inertia still strive to "correct", dictate, rule by phone or, in other words, to ladle the truth out in dozes.

We, professional journalists, should be trusted more. It is in our interests not to permit slanting. Only in this way will our national television be reoriented to the needs of our compatriots, instead of those of the apparat.

Signed: A. Derepa, editor; V. Shcherbachov, commentator; A. Tarasenko, editor; P. Boyko, announcer; O. Deyneko, section chief; L. Karnaukhov, commentator; V. Udovychenko, correspondent; D. Ponamarchuk, senior editor; and 77 other employees.

Ukrainian Autocephalous Church Synod Meets

LD0706151590 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpt] The first all-Ukrainian holy synod of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church [UAOCH] ended in Kiev today. Listen to a report by Dmytro Ponomarchuk.

[Ponomarchuk] According to the data released, 547 delegates from all oblasts of the Ukraine took part in the synod, including over 200 priests and almost as many parishioners. Metropolitan Ioann of Lvov and Galicia, the guardian of the Kiev patriarchate, read messages of greetings from Metropolitan Mstyslav of Kiev, who resides in the United States [was prevented from attending the synod; entry visa was not granted] and from Metropolitan Vasyliy, head of the Ukrainian Church in Canada. Let me remind you that the synod pronounced Metropolitan Mstyslav as patriarch of Kiev and of the whole Ukraine.

The synod also adopted the set of rules concerning the management of the UAOCH. The synod has deemed as invalid the act which made the Ukrainian Church part of the Moscowite Church in 1686 in that it contradicts the canons.

The synod has sent messages to Patriarch Dimitrious of Constantinople and to the primates of all autocephalous

Orthodox churches notifying them of these decisions, and also to other churches, particularly to head of the Church of Rome.

A separate address was dispatched to Volodymyr Ivashko, chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, with a request to assist in the full rehabilitation of the clergy of the UAOCH who were repressed in the past, and in returning all temples and monasteries expropriated by the Stalinist regime. The message assures further that the believers of this church will work for the moral and cultural rebirth of the country and for enhancing the economic and living standard of the people.

The presidium of the synod has released an appeal to the Ukrainian people and to the Ukrainian Orthodox churches in Europe and in the diaspora. The appeal stresses in particular that the resurrected UAOCH deems it very important for normal functioning that the three metropolies of the UAOCH—in the United States, Canada, Australia, and in European and Latin American countries merge into one body. [passage omitted]

Caucasus

Armenian Official Disputes Reports on Incidents

NC0506143890 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Yerevan, 4 Jun (ARMENPRES)—On 31 May the telephone at the ARMENPRES office rang incessantly as callers from all regions in Armenia asked that we identify those "peaceful border regions" against which Armenian "terrorists" have been launching attacks "virtually every day for the last few months," as was reported by TASS news agency and published by PRAVDA on 31 May. The callers were wondering whether an error had not slipped into these reports as the facts reveal something quite different; that is, systematic attacks against Armenian border villages.

To clarify the situation, an ARMENPRES correspondent asked Militia Lieutenant Colonel Yeganyan, chief of the Operations Department at the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Internal Affairs Ministry, to comment on the PRAVDA report. Yeganyan, who is responsible for collecting all information on incidents in the republic, said: The people at the press center of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry know full well that the Armenian- inhabited border settlements in our republic and in the Nagorno- Karabakh Autonomous Oblast have long been the targets of systematic attacks by the Azerbaijani guerrillas who seek to provoke conflicts or exacerbate interethnic relations. It is not clear what form such unscrupulousness took in assessing the events taking place in the region and preparing the report "About the Armenian Situation." Either the press center concealed information provided by a reporter or the TASS correspondent provided one-sided information.

At the Operations Department of the Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry, they showed me the log of fresh incidents, just one of the logs which are sent daily to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. The log reported that on 28 May automatic weapons fire was opened from Musakey village in Kazakhskiy Rayon at viticulturists in the Armenian village of Vazashen who were engaged in agricultural work. The next day, 29 May, Voskepar village in Noyemberyanskiy Rayon came under fire for 10 to 15 minutes from the village of Yukhary Askipara of Kazakhskiy Rayon of the Azerbaijan SSR.

Other crimes have also been reported. Thirty-two calves were stolen from the collective farm in Khnatsakh village in Gorisskiy Rayon on 29 May. It transpired that the theft was committed by Azerbaijanis who took the calves to Lachinskiy Rayon. Twenty-two calves were returned after negotiations, and the Azerbaijanis promised to return the remaining 10 at a later date.

As you can see, despite the clearcut nature of many of these facts, the report "About the Armenian Situation" suffers from tendentiousness. Such deception of the public takes place frequently under the conditions of the ongoing interethnic conflict between the two republics, and is either the consequence of hasty (?preparation) of material for the press or of a biased approach toward elucidating developments in the region.

Internal Ministry Troops Sent to Armenia

NC1506110290 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] According to a statement issued by the Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry, an extremely tense situation has developed in Armenia's Vardenisskiy Rayon and Azerbaijan's Kelbadzharskiy Rayon since 8 June. Tension rose particularly after unidentified persons killed a drover and wounded his two sons with automatic weapons in the pasture of Yelincha village in the Shrchabar region on 11 June.

Following a search by Internal Affairs Ministry troops, Vardenisavan residents Aslanyan and Antonyan were detained at the Vardenisavan collective farm on suspicion of involvement in this crime and were then taken out of Armenia. Khachaturyan, a student at Yerevan's veterinary and animal husbandry institute, and Suchyan, a resident of Kamoyskiy Rayon, were also detained and taken away. This caused dissatisfaction among the local population.

Galstyan, the republic's internal affairs minister, and (?Sarikov), chief of the military operational team of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry troops stationed in Armenia, visited the region on 12 June to calm the situation. With the help of local party, soviet, and law enforcement bodies, they held contacts with representatives of the public and relatives of the detained.

During the meetings, the local population demanded that the illegal armed formations of various informal

organizations be removed from the region and that the security of the population be guaranteed solely by the militia and internal troops.

In view of the dangerous rise in tension, the republic's internal affairs minister dispatched a subunit of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry troops to Vardenisskiy Rayon on 13 June to maintain public order in collaboration with militia officials sent from departments of the Internal Affairs Ministry in Vardenisskiy Rayon and neigboring rayons.

Thanks to the measures taken, one of the detained, the minor Khachaturyan, was returned. The other three were taken to Kursk for interrogation.

Independent Trade Union Established in Armenia

NC1406164690 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1800 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Excerpts] A free and independent trade union has been established in Armenia. Here is a report by our correspondent Armine Tukhikyan from the founding congress of the trade union.

[Tukhikyan] What is the reason behind the creation of the new trade union? Don't the existing trade unions fulfill the same mission? Might a conflict develop between the existing and newly created trade unions? We asked attorney Khachik Arutyunyan, chairman of the organization committee [for the creation of the Cooperative Armenian Free Trade Union], to reply to these questions half an hour before the start of the congress.

[Arutyunyan] The existing trade unions are an appendix to the state organs. Their constitutions even state that they are working under the leadership of the Communist Party, regardless of the fact that Article 6 of the USSR Consitution, which stipulates a leading role for the party in our political system, has already been deleted. I want to stress that the trade unions are controlled by the Communist Party and this impedes them from genuinely protecting workers' rights. Moreover, the primary trade union organizations are under the control and administration of the local primary party organizations. Yet their most important duty was supposed to be to protect workers' rights from the administration. Such facts convinced us of the need to set up a free trade union organization independent of the Communist Party, even independent of any party, and free of control by state organs so that it could genuinely reflect and express the interests of the workers. [passage omitted]

[Tukhikyan] Free trade unions have already been set up in a number of Soviet republics and their success has penetrated the official trade union structures. Thus, a series of professional trade unions have declared their independence from the All-Union Trade Union Council and have set up separate professional trade unions. Undoubtedly, their ranks will increase, soon resulting in the dissloution of the official—that is, dependent—trade unions.

Let us mention that the republic's cooperative workers, self-employed persons, as well as civil servants in the state institutions have registered in Armenia's free trade-unions.

The creation of new trade unions in Armenia is of important political significance. It is the sacred dream of each Armenian to have a free and independent country. However, it is not possible to declare freedom and independence in one day. The road leading to that desirable goal is long and complex. The creation of a free and independent Armenian trade union is undoubtedly a stage on that road.

Armenian Party Leader Visits Laser Institute

NC1406154790 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Vladimir Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, visited the Laser Technology Scientific Production Association of Yerevan State University on 13 June.

A statement issued on the visit notes that the enterprise's products are highly valued by numerous customers in our republic and abroad.

Vladimir Movsisyan familiarized himself with details of the collective's work, and visited production shops and laboratories where artificial crystals are grown and modern technology is developed and tested.

Yerevan's lasers are widely used in machine building, technology, medicine, environmental protection, biology, chemistry, quantum physics, communications, and in scientific research.

Further on New Armenian Interior Minister

NC0606104890 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Yerevan, 5 Jun (ARMENPRES)—Lyova Galustyan has been appointed internal affairs minister of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] by a decree of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Lyova Galustyan, who is 51, graduated from the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry's academy in 1980. Galustyan is a lawyer by profession.

Article on NKAO Situation, Azerbaijani Stance

NC1406152290 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] "Our Only Hope Is Mother Armenia" is the title of an extensive article by Yegishe Sarkisyan. The article specifically notes that for the last five months or so, the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] has

been under a state of emergency run by the closely integrated so-called Republican Organizational Committee and the Office of the Military Commandant.

At the suggestion of the Azerbaijani leadership, the Organizational Committee formulates timely tactical moves which are implemented by the Office of the Military Commandant through the use of automatic weapons and tanks. In the final analysis, the aims of both are the same: to subjugate Artsakh [NKAO], return it to Azerbaijani domination, and turn it into a victim of the new arbitrariness which far exceeds the previous one in scope and cruelty.

The Azerbaijan leadership, (?often aspiring to be a deceitful benefactor) and having the support and protection of the center, is implementing all the possibilities [words indistinct] at its disposal through the Organizational Committee and Office of the Military Commandant, which execute the leadership's will like a (?robot).

The Azerbaijan leadership continues to scorn proposals to solve the NKAO problem and establish a normal situation in the region through negotiations and mutual concessions.

It is also apparent that Baku has redoubled its efforts for the introduction of a state of emergency in Armenia.

The article concludes by stressing that our people are living through fateful days and the people of Artsakh clearly realize that now, as in the past and as it will be in the future, Artsakh can survive only thanks to Armenia. Therefore, we (?wholeheartedly) wish that at the least the political situation in Armenia be stabilized.

Azerbaijan Parliament on State of Emergency

NC1406205090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet has decided on the following measures which are required to provide security for the citizens living in Azerbaijan SSR's rayons which border the Armenian SSR:

The Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet notes that open attacks by the Armenian SSR against Azerbaijan SSR's sovereignty and territorial integrity have been continuing for a long time. This state of affairs has reached such proportions that direct attacks are being made against the sovereign republic. Well-armed terrorist groups have been established in the Armenian SSR. These groups are carrying out systematic attacks against the residential areas of Azerbaijan SSR's rayons that border the Armenian SSR. Merciless violence is being perpetrated, houses are being set on fire and ransacked, and peaceful people, including children, women, and elderly people, are being hurt. An extremely complex situation has been created for economic activity, including work in the fields and the transfer of cattle to the summer grazing grounds. A total of 154 Azerbaijani towns on the 975 km border with the Armenian SSR are in danger.

However, the Armenian SSR's and the USSR's state, government, and administrative organs are not taking effective measures to halt aggression and disarm the armed groups of bandits in the Armenian SSR. In fact, they are trying to legalize these groups in every way.

The Armenian side has long boycotted the logical proposal for the simultaneous adoption of decisions to establish state of emergency zones in the rayons along the entire border of the two republics in order to halt every attempt to fire on the Azerbaijani towns and prevent the infiltration of terrorists into Azerbaijan territories.

Furthermore, the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet also notes that the Soviet president is not fulfilling paragraph 15 of Article 127/3 of the USSR Constitution and the demands of Article 2 of the USSR law on the legal status of the state of emergency. The paragraph and the article referred to point out that even if the republic in question does not approve, the Soviet president can implement a state of emergency and submit the decision adopted in that regard for the approval of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet decides the following:

1. A state of emergency should be declared along Azerbaijan SSR's entire border with the Armenian SSR until the situation is normalized in order to halt the violation of the borders of Azerbaijan, the attacks on Azerbaijan SSR's territorial integrity, and the attempts made against the life, safety, and property of the republic's people and against the republic's ownership rights. The USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet president should be informed of this.

The imposition of a state of emergency regime should be in accordance with paragraphs 1, 3, 16, 17, 19, and 20 of Article 4 of the USSR law, which governs the implementation of a state of emergency regime and which is dated 3 April 1990. Strengthening of the installations which provide for the [word indistinct] activity of the people and economic establishments in the border region, blocking off of the border regions which are frequently attacked by the Armenian SSR, application of a special regimen for citizens who arrive from the Armenian SSR, imposition of curfews in the border regions when necessary, checking of the documents of individuals who cross the Azerbaijani border from the Armenian SSR, and organization of inspections of private property and means of transportation should be considered.

2. The Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Azerbaijan SSR Committee for State Security, with the help of the commanders of the internal troops and the local soviet sovereign organs, should establish the definite borders of the state of emergency region, point out the residential areas, and move to set up command zones in them.

3. A recourse should be made to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR Ministry of Defense, and the USSR Committee for State Security for the dispatch of troops and material and technical aid to the area in which the state of emergency is in force.

4. The Soviet president should immediately be asked to use his authority as the head of the Soviet Union in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 15 of Article 127/3 of the USSR Constitution to take urgent and resolute measures to safeguard Azerbaijan SSR's sovereignty, disarm and disband Armenian SSR's armed operations groups, maintain the security of the people of the Azerbaijan SSR, and restore public law and order and peace in the border region between the two republics.

[Signed] El'mira Kafarova, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet.

Baku City. Dated: 11 June 1990

Arrests Reported for Illegal Crossings Into Iran

NC1406135890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Press release issued by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, SSR, Committee for State Security; date not given]

[Text] As is known, the situation along the border between the Soviet Union and the Islamic Republic of Iran was seriously disrupted by the destruction of border installations and other illegal activities in December 1989 and January 1990. Many cases of illegal crossings between the Soviet Union and the Islamic Republic of Iran were recorded at that time. The smuggling of arms, military material, explosives, drugs, industrial goods, and foodstuffs were observed. All this affected law and order to a certain extent and damaged the republic's economy.

The Azerbaijan SSR Committee for State Security, working with the help of the border guards, has taken appropriate measures to obstruct these crimes. Dozens of Soviet and foreign citizens have been detained and brought to account as a result of these measures. For example, Idadi Latifoglu Abdurakhmanov, born in Salyany in 1961; Suleyman Dzhingizoglu Zamanov, born in Salyany in 1962; and Abbas Sametoglu Madzhidov, born in Salynay in 1963, violated the Soviet border by crossing into the Islamic Republic of Iran. They were detained by border guards while trying to cross back into the Soviet Union.

The Azerbaijan SSR Committee for State Security has turned over their case to the Azerbaijan SSR's Procuracy.

Baku Military Commandant Reports Arrests

NC1406201590 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Notice issued by the military commandant of Baku City on 12 June]

[Text] Citizens: Important political developments took place in the republic last week. The 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress and the plenum held by the Central Committee stated with renewed vigor that the process of stabilizing the situation is irreversible. The work of the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has been evaluated highly. Cooperation between the staff of the commandant's headquarters and city residents continues to improve. We deeply thank those who, by their actions and not just their words, create the conditions that allow establishments and workers to carry out their normal activities.

The commandant's headquarters has received letters, telegrams, and appeals thanking those who have made significant contributions to improving the situation by conscientiously fulfilling their military duties. Here are some examples:

Bakhman Agayev, a resident of Baku and a World War II and labor veteran, notes the importance of the internal troops in the efforts to maintain public law and order. He said: I believe that compulsory measures contribute to normalizing the situation and protecting the security of people of various nationalities.

Citizen Korsh Gevorkova said in her letter: Gallant combatants, we thank you very much for risking your life to protect us. Our sons, we bow our heads before you.

These are not the only people to express the gratitude of the residents of the capital of Azerbaijan.

Regrettably, however, other kinds of developments also took place last week. Despite the relaxation of the state of emergency regulations, public law and order was disrupted and a number of crimes were committed. An operations group arrested citizens Mustafayev and Mekhidzhitov for attempted burglary at 0200 on 10 June. An investigation has been launched into the incident. The command headquarters of the city confiscated 37 vehicles and detained 336 individuals, 307 for violating the curfew, 17 for violating public law and order, and two for committing crimes. [numbers as heard]
[Signed] Major General [name indistinct], military commandant of Baku City

Georgia To Convene Special Parliament Session

LD1406113390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] The presidium of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet has adopted a decree on convening an extraordinary session of the republic's Supreme Soviet on 20 June.

Additions to the decision of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet of 9 March 1990 on guarantees to protect Georgia's state sovereignty will be considered at the forthcoming session. The juridical illegality of Georgia's entry into the USSR is recognised in this decision.

It is also planned to discuss a package of draft laws.

Dispute Between Georgians, Abkhazianis Reported

LD1406112990 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] A conflict has broken about between Georgians and Abkhazianis at a collective farm in Ochamchire rayon in Abkhazia, on whose territory is situated the Georgian village of (Tseresi) and the Abkhazian (Kuton). The Abkhazians have been banished from the tea plantations on which they work. On the night of 12 June a large meeting was held in the village of (Kuton) at which it was decided to prohibit Georgians from entering the tea plantations. As a result work came to a standstill at the collective farm. At the present time talks are going on, attended by the heads of party, local-soviet, law enforcement and economic bodies.

Gorbachev, Others Sign Georgian Writer's Obituary

PM1406134390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Jun 90 Single Edition p 6

[Obituary of Irakliy Luarsabovich Andronikov (Andronikashvili)]

[Excerpts] Multinational Soviet culture has sustained a painful loss. Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor Irakliy Luarsabovich Andronikov (Andronikashvili), the prominent Soviet writer, Lenin and USSR State Prize winner, USSR People's Artist, Honored Artist of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and Honored Scientist of the Georgian SSR, has died in his 82d year.

I.L. Andronikov (Andronikashvili) was born in 1908 in Petersburg. He graduated from the Leningrad University History and Philology Faculty in 1930. [passage omitted]

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, Ye.M. Primakov, B.N. Yeltsin, Yu.A. Manayenkov, R.N. Nishanov, Ch.T. Aytmatov, V.G. Rasputin, A.S. Kapto, G.G. Gumbaridze, I.V. Abashidze, V.R. Asatiani, S.A. Baruzdin, A.A. Voznesenskiy, N.N. Gubenko, S.P. Zalygin, V.V. Karpov, F.F. Kuznetsov, K.Yu. Lavrov, L.M. Leonov, D.S. Likhachev, S.V. Mikhalkov, V.S. Rozov, N.N. Skatov, M.A. Ulyanov. [PRAVDA's obituary lists the above signatories in Russian alphabetical order]

Central Asia

New Data on Famine in Turkmenia Found

LD1406125690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The agency POSTFAKTUM has just cited new data on the discussion on famine in Turkmenia. I will remind you that the discussion started after an article appeared in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA stating that children in the republic are dying of hunger. Many denials followed. Deputies of the Turkmenian Supreme Soviet announced that there are no such cases. And here are the results of research in one of the republics' rayons by the scientist (Anayev). In the last 10 years there has never been any meat, chickens, butter, or milk in the shops of the rayon. Last year in the capital's Ashkhabad Oblast, one in every three children was born with congenital hypertrophy, an illness caused by malnutrition of the mother.

Tajik Delegation Returns From Iran Visit

LD1406225790 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 1600 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] A delegation from Tajikistan, headed by Latifi, deputy chairman of the Tajik Council of Ministers, which had gone to Iran at the invitation of the government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, has returned home. The delegation included representatives of the republican Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and workers of literature and clergy.

The delegation was received by Va'ezi, deputy foreign affairs minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran. In the course of the meeting, he said that Iran is striving for cooperation in the spheres of science, culture and art, and regular exchange of delegations. Both sides stated that they will study in detail the issue of establishing friendship societies in Iran and Tajikistan.

Mudslides Hit Tajikistan, Casualties Reported

PM1206153390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Aleksandr Karpov dispatch under the rubric "Direct Line": "The Elements Have Brought Misfortune"]

[Text] Dushanbe—The torrential rain that has fallen in the last few days over Tajikistan has caused great damage.

In Komsomolabadskiy Rayon in the night of 5-6 June alone, severe mudslides from the surrounding mountains caused serious damage to the inhabitants of villages in the area. Several houses were completely destroyed in the settlement of Tegermi. Six persons were killed, three of them children. Two people killed on the night of 8-9

June have been found in Pendzhikentskiy Rayon. Twenty houses were flooded in the same night in Kulyab, the oblast center.

The events of the last few days have seriously complicated life for people in villages in Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast, which borders on Afghanistan. The water level of Pyandzh River has risen by two meters, almost completely submerging houses in the small population centers along its banks. Fortunately there have been no casualties here. The republic government is helping the victims: Insurance and one-shot allowances are being paid, everyone without a roof over their head is being housed in temporary accomodation, and food is being taken to the disaster regions.

"According to preliminary estimates, the material damage caused to the national economy by the elements in the last one and a half months amounts to no less than 50 million rubles," Yu. Zatsarinnyy, deputy chairman of the Tajik Council of Ministers, said. "Equipment is needed to eliminate the effects of the disaster: Primarily bulldozers, but we also need cement, concrete, and hardware. The situation with diesel fuel and gasoline is very bad. Because of constant disruptions in the supply of petroleum products, our Ministry of Automotive Transport has already 'dipped into' the quota for the second half of the year..."

I should add to what I have already said that the situation in which people in Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast have found themselves could have been largely resolved had it not been for the state of emergency in Kirghizia. The fact is that the city of Osh has a large service station which belongs to Tajikistan's automotive industry. It has many things that are needed here now. It would be simpler and more convenient to carry freight to the Pamir region from Osh. But that is impossible: The risk that truck drivers will fall victim to extremists is too great....

According to weather forecasts, a period of hot weather is going to set in throughout Tajikistan in the next few days. This means that the Pamir snows will start to thaw rapidly. The water level of the Pyandzh River will not go down. The situation will remain difficult.

Direct Transport for Uzbek Pilgrims Decreed

LD0506224290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1212 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Pruger]

[Text] Tashkent, 5 June (TASS)— Islam Karimov, president of Uzbekistan, has issued a decree "on the pilgrimage by Muslims to Saudi Arabia." This document satisfies the request of adherents of Islam in Soviet Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan to create normal conditions for carrying out a pilgrimage to the holy places of the Muslim world.

The president's decree envisages transporting groups of believers (totalling 500 people) in the period from 19 June to 10 July this year by direct air routes to the town of Jeddah and back along a route agreed with the Saudi authorities. The Uzbek civil aviation directorate is allocating aircraft for this.

The procedure for filling in documents for going abroad is being considerably simplified for pilgrims; the president has issued instructions to the appropriate departments for this. The believers will be accompanied en route by doctors who will render them help if required.

In the opinion of Mufti Mukhammad-Sadyk Mukhammad-Yusuf, chairman of the spiritual directorate of the Muslims of Central Asia, this presidential decree is yet further evidence of the radical changes which have taken place in relations between the Soviet state and believers in the years of perestroyka.

Uzbek Decree on Foreign Trade Examined

LD1406122790 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] The decree of the president of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] on the formation of the state committee of the Uzbek SSR for foreign trade and foreign contacts: With the aim of providing for sovereign rights of the Uzbek SSR, and coordinating work for the further development of the economic, trade, scientific and technical, and cultural contacts of the republic with foreign countries, it is considered necessary to set up the State Committee of the Uzbek SSR for Foreign Trade and Foreign Contacts—GOSKOM VNESHNETORG Svyazi of Uzbek SSR [State Committee of Foreign Trade and Foreign Contacts of Uzbek SSR]. This committee will be responsible for the implementation of multilateral contacts and development of new methods of cooperation with foreign countries; for study of the state of the market; for coordination of activities; for providing for the interests of the participants in these contacts on the territory of the republic; for supervising the implementaion of the set plans for supplies and agreements, and for assisting in organization of joint enterprises, associations, trade houses, and joint-stock companies with the participation of foreign partners, and also the organizaion of cultural, sport, tourist, and other contacts under mutually advantageous conditions. The Council of Ministers of the republic has adopted a corresponding resolution on this question.

Uzbek Forestry Produce Directorate Formed

LD1506130390 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] A decree of the president of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] forms the Main Directorate for the Supply and Marketing of Raw Materials and Produce from the Forestry Industry [uzglavlessnabsbyt] within the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR.

The Main Directorate for the Supply and Marketing of the Forest Industry, with the aim of implementing specific steps for the strengthening of the economic independence and the sovereign rights of the Uzbek SSR and providing protection in this republic for the marketing of cotton, cocoons, silk, [word indistinct], natural and synthetic fibers, and others produced on its territory, in addition to a more consistent supply of raw and other materials, and additional services for light industry enterprises, is to form the Main Directorate for the Supply and Marketing of Raw Materials and Produce in the produce range of light industry, within the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR Head Directorate for the Supply and Marketing of Forestry Industry Produce, on the basis of financial autonomy. The Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR is to adopt the corresponding resolutions on this question.

Andizhan 'Normalizing' Under State of Emergency

PM1206114990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Astafyev report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "State of Emergency—Day Four"]

[Text] Andizhan—This is the fourth day that the Uzbek city of Andizhan and five rayons in the oblast adjoining Kirghizia have been living in conditions of a state of emergency. Events in neighboring Osh Oblast have caused unrest among the local population.

The imposition of a state of emergency by the president of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic and the introduction of extra internal troops and militia forces have made it possible to normalize the situation somewhat. In any event, enterprises and institutions have not stopped work. There have been interruptions to public transport but it continued operating.

The situation is complicated by the fact that corpses are continuing to arrive from Kirghizia. Each new victim causes a fresh outburst of indignation. Emotions sometimes boil over and affect people not involved in the events. For example, at Andizhan railroad station an excited group of young people attacked and beat up two army reservists of Kirghiz nationality who were returning home from military service.

Reportage on Kirghizia Ethnic Conflict

Violence Declines

PM1206124190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Colonel A. Ladin report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "People Want Calm"]

[Text] Osh Oblast—Last Sunday I visited the part of the city of Osh that locals call "Cheremushki." I had been invited there by Nadir Shamurzayev, director of the Osh Kirghiz Drama Theater. We witnessed an unusual display of people's diplomacy. People living in districts next to privately-owned new Uzbek residential areas had decided to put an end to the fear and suspicion existing among the different nationalities living there. They had organized a collection of money, bought food, and arranged a joint meal for the neighborhood at noon—a friendship meal.

As officer I. Zubko, chief of the Osh garrison, told me, similar meetings are being held in the spirit of local traditions in many villages in neighboring rayons. There were lots of people on the streets of Osh city itself Sunday.

At the Osh Oblast Soviet Executive Committee Internal Affairs Administration alert unit, I was told that attempts to destabilize the situation in some rayons had occurred nonetheless. For example, four unidentified people had thrown home-made grenades at a curfew patrol in Osh city. Fortunately there were no casualties.

In Sovetskiy Rayon criminals broke into the DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] raykom [rayon committee] building and stole five small-bore rifles. In the same place 750 12-bore cartridges disappeared from the office of the chairman of the local hunting society. An investigation is in progress. Two dead bodies with contusions and knife wounds were discovered in a field of the V.I. Lenin Kolkhoz in Kara-Suyskiy Rayon. There have been two gang fights in the rayon center of Kara-Suu itself.

Nevertheless, I must point out that cases of that kind are on the decline. The motorized riflemen and assault troops who are helping the militia and internal troops to maintain law and order are doing their job efficiently and properly. In recent days military airmen have been making frequent trips to various parts of the oblast, carrying diverse cargoes of freight and people.

The cavalry troop commanded by Major V. Melkonyan is currently performing a difficult tour of duty isolated from its unit. The cavalrymen proved very useful when the need arose to quickly reach some remote pastures and grazing lands across open country and mountain streams to protect from violence Uzbek stockraisers tending their animals in the Kirghiz mountains. But unfortunately many of the Uzbek shepherds succumbed to instinctive fear, abandoned their herds and flocks, and simply skedaddled. Not all of them, admittedly. I should like to mention the courage of those who stayed in the hills to do their duty and save the people's property. They are all now safe under the protection of military subunits.

Report on Casualties

LD1406104790 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] According to reliable information, 148 people were killed, and 885 people required medical assistance, of whom 748 have been sent to hospital, during the tragic

events in Osh Oblast. Some 200,000 firearms have been confiscated by the militia in Osh Oblast and another 49 in Frunze. At present the situation in Kirghizia is stabilizing.

Disturbances 'Organized'

LD1406142790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] According to reports from TASS correspondents, in the last few hours the situation has become calmer in Osh olast of Kirghizia. At any rate no shots have been heard, either during the night or in the morning. Our correspondent Aleksandr Goryanov returned from Osh oblast, Kirghizia, today. We offer for your attention an interview with the deputy political officer of one of the motorized infantry battalions that are there at the present time. The interview was given near the rayon center of Gulcha where until quite recently weapons were transferred by Kirghiz extremists. The interview contains an interesting version of the degree of organization in the mass pogroms.

[Goryanov] Comrade major, from whom have these weapons been confiscated.

[Unidentified officer] All these weapons have been confiscated from the so-called extremists, as we call them, who have tried to make a breakthrough into the town of Osh in order to render assistance to their own people as they put it.

[Goryanov] What day was that?

[Officer] That was on 5 and 6 June this year.

[Goryanov] And how did you act in those circumstances?

[Officer] On the orders of the unit's commander, we covered the Internal Affairs Directorate. Soldiers were posted there. A post was set up in the direction of the town of Osh, and they tried to make a break past it with these weapons. And the soldiers disarmed them all. Approximately 1,000 people broke through on vehicles, on motor vehicles.

[Goryanov] You have called them extremists. Are they local inhabitants or people who have come from somewhere else?

[Officer] They are partly local residents, as well as people who have come from settlements and villages in the mountains.

[Goryanov] What is the cause of such ethnic disagreement, such ethnic conflict?

[Officer] Well, I think that first and foremost the reason is not ethnic disagreement. Evidently there were people here who prepared all this, in connection with the 28th party congress, evidently, in connection with the Kirghiz congress, in order to undermine the foundations somewhere.

[Goryanov] That is, there are forces here, that is conservative forces which are interested in destabilization.

[Officer] Evidently that is how it is because on the fifth and sixth when we were working here, it could be seen that that was somewhat organized. Not completely, of course. If it had been completely organized, it would naturally have been much worse. But there was some kind of organization.

[Goryanov] Are there any casualties among the soldiers and officers?

[Officer] No, we don't have any. There is not a single casualty. [video shows landscape with helicopters, weapons laid out on the ground, and interview with officer in combat uniform]

Curfew 'Cut'

PM1406103790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel A. Ladin report "From Osh Oblast" under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Curfew Reduced"]

[Text] During an operations meeting at Osh Oblispolkom [Oblast Soviet Executive Committee] Internal Affairs Administration the Osh City commandant, Militia Major General V. Goncharov, Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] minister of internal affairs, described the situation in the oblast center and Osh Oblast. According to him, a general process of stabilization is under way. This has made it possible to adopt the decision to cut the curfew. As of 14 June it is to come into force throughout the oblast at 2200 hours.

Life in Osh City is by and large returning to normal. Curfew precinct chiefs—there are eight of them—report that most enterprises are operational; however, only 46-65 percent of workers and employees are turning up for work. Thus the economy is still incurring losses. In an interview with KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Zh. Bekbolotov, chairman of Osh Oblispolkom, stressed that in the ten days since the disturbances began industrial enterprises have failed to supply output worth more than 16 million rubles.

Militia bodies are receiving reports with increasing frequency from storekeepers, public catering workers, and drivers of motorized passenger transport that unknown persons are demanding that they stop work, threatening them with reprisals. An attempt was made 12 June to set fire to a motor convoy delivering flour to the oblast center and the surrounding villages. Fortunately, the "firebrands" did not damage the vehicles or the freight. There were no casualties among the drivers or the soldiers guarding the convoy.

People with video and photographic equipment have begun to infiltrate the areas where the curfew has been introduced. These people do not have the relevant authorization from the commandants, and the "product" that they are trying to circulate is of an inflammatory nature. The tapes and photographs present a one-sided view of the processes taking place in the "hotspots" and have only one aim—to wreck the process of stabilizing the situation and fuel new seats of conflict.

The Kirghiz SSR minister of internal affairs has decided to step up the fight against the blackmailers and the people trying to morally and physically terrorize transport, public catering, and trading personnel. The appropriate specific instructions have been issued with regard to flushing out and arresting people of this kind.

Owing to the increasingly frequent thefts of property from homes abandoned by their inhabitants (Osh Garrison servicemen caught a habitual offender of this kind red-handed), precinct inspectors and precinct commandants have been tasked with taking steps to prevent the theft of citizens' personal property.

At Osh Oblispolkom our correspondent was also told that more than 200 tents have been sent to Uzgen, where the population has particularly suffered from arson attacks. The USSR Ministry of Health has allocated Osh Oblast's medical establishments two complete field hospitals.

According to Lieutenant Colonel (Internal Service) I. Vasilyev, leader of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] temporary press center in Kirghizia, it has been established in the course of work by the USSR Prosecutor's Office and MVD operations investigation group and a forensic medical examination that 148 people died during the period of mass disturbances. Amended figures indicate that 885 people sustained bodily injuries, of whom 748 were hospitalized.

Over the last 24 hours 40 firearms and 27 petrol bombs have been confiscated from the population.

Tents, Other Aid Airlifted to Osh Oblast

PM1406122990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jun 90 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Timely Assistance"]

[Text] An aircraft which took off from "Domodedovo" Airport yesterday will deliver freight to Kirghizia earmarked for those who have suffered as a result of the tragic events in Osh Oblast. Stowed on board are 500 10-person tents, dressings, blankets, and bedclothes.

This is the response of the USSR Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies to the request for assistance from the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic. The republic Red Cross Society Central Committee has reported that more than 180 houses have been destroyed in Osh Oblast and hundreds of families have been left without shelter, clothes, or food. Much is being done in the republic to help the victims. In particular, 60,000 rubles have been allocated for these needs out of the society's funds.

Osh Transport Functioning, Investigation Begins

PM1506095190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jun 90 First Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Guilty Will Be Punished"]

[Text] Frunze, 14 Jun—Passenger transport in Kirghizia's Osh Oblast, brought to a halt by tragic events, has now resumed. Transport routes from the oblast center to Kyzyl-Kiya, Dzhalal-Abad, Naukat, and Kara-Su are open again. There are still no passenger links to three rayons where the situation has yet to be stabilized. Yesterday the first buses entered the Uzbek city of Andizhan.

For the first time in the last two weeks, a convoy from the Pamir Automotive Transport Enterprise, accompanied by a line-unit detail, went to Tajikistan's Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast for foodstuffs and other goods.

An investigative operations group of members of the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office, the USSR KGB, and the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, among whom are well-known criminologists, senior experts, and forensic scientists, has arrived in Osh Oblast to establish the causes of the bloody events.

Musaliyev Reads Report to Kirghiz Congress

LD1406210290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Text] The 19th congress of the Communist Party of Kirghizia commenced its work in Frunze today. Our correspondent Aleksandr Mirtov reports:

The 19th congress of the Communist Party of Kirghizia convened in a complex situation. The unhealed wounds of the tragic events in Osh oblast are still bleeding. Naturally, special attention was paid to these events in the report of the Central Committee to the party congress, which was delivered by Musaliyev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kirghizia. In particular, he quoted the following figures: Up to the present time today, 14 June, the number of dead has risen to 150 people, and over 800 people wounded. As the speaker stressed, several investigation groups of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Procuracy, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and Committee for State Security, which are engaged in the investigation of crimes and the exposure of those who instigated and incited the bloody conflict, are working in the oblast. As soon as the investigation is over, all those guilty will be named and committed for trial.

When analyzing the social and economic situation in the republic, the first secretary of the Central Committee of the republic's Communist Party noted that despite some

advances in stabilizing the economy, very many problems remain. The low growth of labor productivity in industry, the violation of contractual obligations by many enterprises, and a high proportion of unfinished construction are not satisfactory. The agro-industrial complex of Kirghizia is producing less than the average index for the country as a whole. In order to provide all the citizens of Kirghizia with apartments or private houses by the year 2000, it is necessary to commission about 3 million square meters of residential floor space annually; unfortunately, the present resources of the construction industry cannot provide it.

A firm course of raising the standard of people's living in the conditions of transition to a market economy has been taken. The party organizations, the speaker noted, must change their style and methods of work: Excessive paperwork and administration by mere decree needed by no one must be replaced by the initiative, independence, and creativity of the full-time party workers as well as all communists.

The report noted that despite the fact that the Communist Party has renounced monopoly on power, communists need not leave the political arena; only specific actions that strengthen the democratization of society and better people's lives can enhance the authority of our party.

Delegates who spoke later in debates supported the provisions of the report as a whole, expressed a number of critical observations, and submitted their proposals on the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee to the 28th congress and draft rules of the CPSU, which were discussed along with the report.

There are several more questions on the agenda of the congress: In particular, the elections of the ruling bodies of the Communist Party of Kirghizia, elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the discussion of an action program for the republic's Communist Party in the near future.

More on Report

LD1406175290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A congress of the Communist Party of Kirghizia opened in Frunze today. Comrade Musaliyev, first secretary of the Communist Party of Kirghizia Central Committee, began the Central Committee report on the progress of perestroyka and the tasks of the republican party organization with an analysis of the tragic events in Osh oblast and the disturbances that were caused in Frunze by the unsanctioned rallies of representatives of Kirghizian young people. They had categorically demanded the resignation of the republic's leadership. Although the congress expressed support for the government and the measures it had taken to restore order, many delegates noted a direct connection between this crisis and the calamitous socioeconomic position of people in the densely populated rural areas. The restructuring processes falling behind the democratic changes in society also had an effect. [video shows delegates at congress; Musaliyev speaking at rostrum; further pictures of delegates on the platform and in the hall]

The congress agenda includes a debate on the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th party congress and the CPSU rules. There will be elections of the leading bodies of the CP of Kirghizia and also of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

The congress is continuing its work.

Nazarbayev Appoints Zheltikov Trade Minister

LD1406035990 Alma-Ata SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN in Kazakh 6 Jun 90 p 1

["Decree of the President of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] To appoint Comrade Zheltikov, Oktyabr Ivanovich as trade minister of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and to release him from the post of deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers.

[Signed] N.Nazarbayev, President of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic.
City of Alma-Ata, 5 June 1990.

Semipalatinsk Leader on Nuclear Test Impact

LD1406125190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] As we have already reported, the Soyuz group of deputies has held a press conference devoted to its trip to the region of the Semipalatinsk test site. Olga Vasilenko, our correspondent, has, in connection with this, had a chat with Kifrim Bastayevich Boztayev, chairman of Semipalatinsk Oblast Soviet and a people's deputy of the USSR.

[Begin recording] [Boztayev] We did not know about this group. They have come by special flight, by Tu-154 from Moscow, without any warning. They did not meet our people. They have not been to the settlements of Semipalatinsk, especially not to the settlements where people have been suffereing during 40 years of unprecedented nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk test range. They have not seen the people, have not met them. They did not see the tragedy. Therefore, their opinions are only of deeply subjective importance. They do not correspond to the facts. I have not seen them. We did not take part in anything. We are learning everything through TASS material.

[Vasilenko] What is your attitude to statements made by those scientists, in particular Professor Tsib, who is cited

by the group and who affirms that there were no any harmful influences and there are none at the present time?

[Boztayev] We have this document. It is almost 15 years of air and ground tests of very powerful uranium, hydrogen, and fission bombs. Without any measures to protect the population. All this from 1949 until 1963. All this was fully recognized by the commission, we can produce documents. There is a conclusion of a big group of scientists and now of the specialists of applied medicine of our oblast, of Kazakhstan about the ruinous influence of underground nuclear tests on the health of people. The underground explosion causes psychosis among the population. After every explosion the number of people using medical establishments increases twofold of threefold. The influence of underground nuclear waves on health have not been studied yet.

[Vasilenko] Tell us, what kind of measures are you going to take as the first secretary, as the chairman of the oblast soviet, together with your oblast party committee, with the oblast soviet in order to speed up the elimination of these consequences, to help the people, to help them in Social aspect as well?

[Boztayev] We ourselves... You know, during the 40 years of intensive tests of nuclear weapons on the Semipalatinsk densely populated land, among the population-...[changes thought] There was no help whatsoever, no benefits or compensation. At the same time those who work at this facility have great benefits and compensations.

[Vasilenko] Are you living there permanently?

[Boztayev] For three years already, for three and a half years I have been the first secretary of the oblast party committee in Semipalatinsk. I myself, come from Semipalatinsk oblast. But I was working in East Kazakhstan for a long time. It is also a neighboring oblast. Well, what has to be done now, yes? Now there is no alternative. The only way out is to cease the nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk test range. For people's sake, for health's sake. After all, people's health is the most sacred thing, the most valuable. What else do we need? How on earth can the nuclear weapons tests be held against the will of the people? It is immoral, it is inhuman to hold nuclear tests in densely populated areas, in conditions of psychosis, in conditions of ruinous impact on people's health. It is my official position, I state it everywhere.

[Vasilenko] Tell us, did you hear anything about the way out of the situation which has emerged in the speech made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the session when he reported on his visit to the United States? After all, there were a number of suggestions connected with your region in his speech.

[Boztayev] I listened to the report made by the president. We will protect the interests of our people, we will make the voice of our people heard by the president, by the government and by the corps of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet. [end recording]

Buildings Destroyed in Kazakh Earthquake

LD1506121690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] As has already been reported, an earthquake with a force of 7-8 points at its epicenter occured on 14 June in Kazakhstan.

According to preliminary information, over 160 buildings, mainly old structures, have been destroyed. Cracks have appeared in some houses in Ust-Kamenogorsk.

Despite the fact that the natural disaster struck during the evening, there was no panic among the population. The oblast's inhabitants had been informed in good time about action that would be necessary in the event of an earthquake.

Measures to eliminate the consequences of the earthquake are now being taken in the emergency situations headquarters.